

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. LIV, No. 14
WHOLE No. 1370

January 11, 1936

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS —Note and Comment.....	317-321
TOPICS OF INTEREST: Whither Labor? United Front; Fascism; Mexico by David Goldstein—Industrial and Craft Unions by Reginald T. Kennedy—A New Catholic Youth Movement by Bonaventure Schwinn, O.S.B.—Young Communists by Thomas J. Diviney	322-328
EDUCATION: Is Liberal Learning in Peril? by Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.....	328-329
SOCIOLOGY: On Rediscovering the Constitution by William F. Kuhn.....	329-331
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF by The Pilgrim.....	331-332
LITERATURE: Willa Cather as a Critic by Camille McCole.....	332-333
REVIEWS OF BOOKS ..333-335.. COMMUNICATIONS ..336-337.. CHRONICLE ..	338-340

How Much Do We Need?

ONE of the "comic strips" popular a few years ago was entitled "Keeping up with the Joneses." The author pictured a family of uncertain and always extremely moderate income which was continually getting into trouble through its efforts to imitate a wealthy family of the name of Jones. While the artistic merit of this composition was negligible, the moral was valuable.

But it is generally neglected, and that neglect furnishes one reason why this economic depression bears more hardly upon some families and individuals than upon others on the same economic level. They are not suffering from lack of necessities, but from want of things which they improperly consider to be necessary. As St. Ignatius might put it, they have never learned the law for the use of creatures.

It has been said that in 1930 the women of this country (aided, probably, by some of the men) spent about \$1,000,000,000 on powders, patches, perfumes, creams, beauty parlors, and similar devices for painting the lily. For the daughter of Eve who in those days expended an average of \$5.00 per week for the care of her complexion and of her crowning glory, we have today a damozel of pale cast, weeping because that expenditure must be cut by \$4.95. Nearly a century ago, the girls of Nazareth Academy, a famous Kentucky school, were wont to rise before the sun to wash their visages in the dew, a cosmetic locally reckoned more potent than Kalydor's for creating peach-blown cheeks, glossy ringlets, and sparkling orbs. Nature's beauty parlor is ever moderate in its fees. True, it cannot be visited by city dwellers, but all can find an equivalent in common soap and tap water, and be none the less charming.

Expenses mount in these days, not always because

necessities increase, but because we feed our desires. Young people hold back from marriage on economic grounds, instead of pooling their poverty with love, and learning the sweetness of a dinner of herbs. They will not dare until they have reached an economic level which, in many cases, their parents won only after a quarter of a century of married life. Father and mother began with two rooms, and a weekly income of \$15, but their sons and daughters must see at least \$3,600 per year, clear, at least three rooms in a modern apartment, at least a Ford, a radio, and a part-time maid, before they venture. They are not content with necessities. They demand conveniences, and some contact with luxury. When the breadwinner is fortunate, he retains his position, and, at appropriate intervals, asks and receives an increase in salary. More fortunate is he, and more rare in the social body, when his demands do not run ahead of his income.

But let us not pour out upon the young the last drop from our vials of wrath. Perhaps they are not to be censored too seriously, when their elders share their folly. It was a famous professor of economics who, near the end of the silly season, 1920-1930, wrote two huge volumes on purchases by the instalment plan, and devoted several heavy chapters to prove, chiefly for the benefit of a great manufacturing corporation, that today it is quite impossible to distinguish between a necessity and a luxury. Our learned professor preached to minds that were more than willing to be convinced; it was pleasant to find a scientific basis for their practice of buying what they could not afford to pay for, either now, or at any time, without mortgaging their financial lives, and neglecting duties imposed by religion and by common sense. Far too many of us are still only seven years old in eschewing the spinach, and insisting upon meals composed entirely of pie.

The economist will insist that we must buy to sustain the market which at the moment is taking an upward swing. Otherwise, he contends, men cannot be put back to work. We agree, but even more important is it to cut our coat according to our cloth. We hurt no market by buying necessities, and passing by with averted eyes the Mayfair which shows luxuries only. According to Dr. Edward L. Thorndyke, in his address as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, as it is we spend less than a third of our income for bare necessities.

Probably we spend less than half of it for commodities that are reasonably necessary. A close examination, will show that many of Dr. Thorndyke's conclusions are based upon the airy foundation of subjective interpretation of incomplete statistics; but an equally close examination of our own consciences will convince many, perhaps most of us, that content is compatible with a flat pocket-book. We may go beyond this assertion to contend that, without reference to national periods of depression or opulence, man finds true happiness in moderating, not in fostering, his desires for material goods. Modern economic science has thrown light into many dark places. But it has as yet discovered no acceptable substitute for the folly of Francis of Assisi, which was the folly of Jesus of Nazareth. To be content with that which suffices, and to take no thought for the morrow, is not and can never be a doctrine at variance with economics. It is the doctrine preached by One Who knew man and loved him. The forgetfulness of that teaching has made the world a place where men race madly for wealth, and find in the end only disillusion and bitterness.

Poverty and Destitution

IT is true that we shall always have the poor with us. But that does not mean that we need not trouble ourselves greatly to alleviate the lot of the destitute. For poverty is not destitution.

Poverty, willingly accepted, or, with Francis, gladly sought, is a state to be encouraged. It makes good citizens in this world, and prepares for citizenship in the Kingdom of God. Poverty means "just enough," and it is good for the state to have a body of citizens who prefer to go through life, giving an example to their fellows of careers that are happy and useful precisely because they are not encumbered with superfluities. But to be destitute means to be deprived of what one needs for his very sustenance. That sort of want is good neither for the state nor for the individual.

As St. Thomas writes (in the delightful translation of Prior McNabb, O.P.), a certain amount of comfort is necessary for the practice of virtue. Destitution is not necessarily the cause of vice and crime, as some of our moderns hold, but that it predisposes to evil doing is beyond argument. It is difficult for one whose belly cleaves for hunger to his backbone to subscribe wholeheartedly to a learned dissertation on the right to hold property. It is difficult for children to grow up in the

fear of God, when their nursery is a tenement in a slum, and their baby eyes first open on scenes of vice.

Against the causes which lead to destitution, and periodically create nation-wide destitution, every upright man must fight, as in a sacred crusade. Our Divine Leader was poor; but except in His last moments on the Cross, He was not destitute. As a village artisan, He labored for bread for Himself and His Blessed Mother, but, as far as tradition bears witness, the little house at Nazareth never knew for any long period actual want. The Church blesses and encourages evangelical poverty, but she has never blessed destitution.

She contemplates, and prays for, and works for, a social and economic order in which man by the sweat of his brow can provide for his family in a manner which enables them not to exist merely, but to live in keeping with their dignity as children of God. She has no countenance for any system under which any man (or group of men) is able to hold so large a share of the earth's natural resources that the many must necessarily want, or for financial systems which permit a few leaders to exercise control over the credit of a whole continent. To work for the order which the Church through her Pontiffs, notably Leo XIII and Pius XI, has described, and to oppose all that hinders it, is a religious duty.

Between the poverty which the Church exalts and blesses, and the desire of every upright man to have enough to provide for his needs, there is no contradiction. What the Church condemns in all is excessive love of the goods of this world. As for destitution, that destitution with which the economic depression has made us familiar, she bids us to summon every energy to create a world in which it has no place.

The Value of Opposition

APOLITICAL leader, whose prominence among Democratic politicians makes him the indicating digit while the others are ciphers, recently commiserated the Republicans on their lack of what is styled "Presidential timber." The only difference between the present Republican candidates is, he believes, that one might possibly be weaker than another. Hence, instead of making a search for the best possible candidate, the Republicans might as well choose any two at random and permit them to throw dice for the honor of leading the party.

We cannot pretend to the intimate knowledge of the sad plight of the Republicans possessed by this Warwick of the Democratic party. But we hope that he is wrong. If the opposition party is bankrupt, our tears are not for the party as such, which has many sins that call for repentance, but for the country. This country has never seen a political party so free from faults in head and heart, so girt with courage and endowed with wisdom, that our political destinies might long be entrusted to its exclusive keeping without peril. What every party needs is a candid friend, and if it cannot have that treasure, an acceptable substitute is a gadfly.

In the days of Cleveland, the Republican party viewed with dismay and pointed with alarm, and the results were, on the whole, good. The opposition made Cleveland stick to his guns when he thought he was right, and induced him to take counsel (for he was an intelligent man), when he thought he might be in error. It would have been well for the country, had the Democratic party shown itself equally suspicious in the opening months of the reign of Harding.

In one of his first "fireside talks" to the country, President Roosevelt disclaimed all pretensions to a monopoly of wisdom, and asked his fellow-citizens to inform him when in their judgment he went wrong. The President probably realizes the value of a strong opposition party, but he has never had it. Whatever criticism he may have received from private citizens, he received none from his first Congress, which practically abdicated its constitutional functions by enacting measures which few of the members even read, and fewer still analyzed, apparently on the ground that the President demanded them. The more important of these measures have been held unconstitutional. Hence plans for economic reforms which the country needs have been deferred, as far as the Federal Government is in question, to the Greek Kalends.

To our regret, we must agree with our Democratic leader that it is idle to think of a third party which can win at the polls next November. From the very rise of the American party system, men have dreamed of an organization which would include the best in each party, and exclude the worst. But with us reform parties die a-borning, or, as with Lincoln's party, soon lose their distinctive character as agents of reform. Until the average of human nature rises to a higher level, perhaps the best we can hope for is a party out of power dedicated to the mission of alert, pointed, and constructive criticism.

Neutrality Laws

TOWARD the end of the year, an elaborate plan for neutrality legislation was submitted by a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. James T. Shotwell, of Columbia University. The committee acted, it is claimed, in the name of the National Peace Conference, an organization recently established on a permanent basis by thirty national peace societies. The report of the committee will be submitted to leading members in both Houses of Congress, in the hope, of course, that it will be influential in shaping legislation to succeed the present neutrality code which expires on February 29.

The main difficulty, as far as this country is concerned, turns upon two points; first, what shall the embargo embrace, and, second, shall it be left to the President's discretion to declare an embargo, and to fix its content? It is generally recognized that the present situation is unsatisfactory. Almost from the outset the neutrality legislation of the last Congress has been recognized as a makeshift, and one, at that, of very doubtful value. It can be said with certainty that it has not affected in any

serious manner the shipments that have been made for months, and are still made, to a European country now at war. Since it was drawn up with precisely this contingency in view, it may be said, without much exaggeration, to be an open and acknowledged failure. An embargo exists, but as it does not affect copper, oil, steel, and other essential war materials, it does not notably hamper any nation now at war.

The Shotwell plan, as we understand it, includes in the embargo not only arms and ammunition, but all "articles or commodities essential to the continuing conduct of war." In this, the plan agrees with that which this Review has advocated from the beginning. In war, bread for the civilian population is quite as necessary as ammunition for the army. Next, however, the plan proposes to authorize the President to draw a line of distinction, and to enforce the embargo only against the aggressive party in the war. No embargo will be raised against a nation which has been attacked, in violation of the Pact of Paris, provided that a majority of the signatories to that pact can agree in identifying the aggressor, and provided further that Congress assents.

It seems to us that this "escape clause" is a fatal weakness in the Shotwell plan. In another scheme of existence, where men could find the evidence, and a majority of nations agree that it was evidence, the plan would work satisfactorily. But who, even after twenty years, can assess with substantial justice the aggressors in the World War? Even granting that some now feel that they have the truth, can they claim that the world had it in 1914 or even in 1918? In the event of a war on the Continent, all Europe would look to us as to a storehouse of money and of war materials. The matter of war loans has already been arranged by a fairly satisfactory ban. But as to munitions, including in the term everything except money and credits, the Shotwell plan would involve us hopelessly in foreign quarrels.

We cannot escape the conclusion that, in the event of war in Europe, the wisest policy is to enforce a comprehensive embargo against all parties. For that reason we believe that the embargo should not be left to the discretion of the President, but should automatically go into effect against all belligerents as soon as a state of war is certified. We realize perfectly well that even at the present moment the profiteers are gathering in their unearned millions, and the influence they bring to bear upon the Government is powerful. Let Congress serve notice on the world that no nation may borrow from this country or import from it, and we extricate ourselves from a host of difficulties. The profiteers who dragged us into the World War are now fighting the mandatory embargo. That is one reason—among many—why lovers of peace should support it.

Persecution in Germany

THE year ended with assurances that the persecutions in Germany of all who dissent from the dictates of the tyranny there established will be continued. Of

this unhappy fact the report submitted on December 30 by James G. McDonald is clear evidence.

For two years Mr. McDonald has acted as High Commissioner for the League of Nations to deal with the problem of Jewish and other refugees from Germany. About 500,000 Jews, Mr. McDonald reports, are subjected to sore persecution for the sole reason, as far as can be discovered, that they are not "Nordics." About 85,000, of whom some 15,000 are as yet unplaced, have left Germany to find a home in other countries. The story is tragic, but, according to Mr. McDonald, new tragedies are impending. Hence the League of Nations is requested "to appeal to the German Government in the name of humanity and of the principles of the public law of Europe."

But Jews are not the sole objects of persecution in Germany, although Mr. McDonald does not directly refer to this fact. All who differ with the policy of the Government at once fall under the ban. Not only are the Catholic clergy subjected to insult and imprisonment for vindicating the rights of their sacred office, but young Catholics find entrance into business and the professions exceedingly difficult, if they wish to remain Catholics.

That Mr. McDonald's protest will be effective, we doubt. But for the sake of our common humanity, it is well that a protest be made.

Note and Comment

The Frying Pan And the Fire

IF Colonel Lindbergh, as is reported, fled from America because of invasions of his privacy by newspapermen, we wonder if he will not be worse off than he was here. Yellow journalism, to believe no less an authority on Fleet Street than G. K. Chesterton, has gone to greater lengths in England than it ever did here. Photographers who rolled stones down on the cottage of such a national hero as Lawrence of Arabia in order to make him come out and show himself are not likely to respect the privacy of any American. Letters have appeared with frequency in the London *Times* from prominent persons complaining of outrages on personal privacy by photographers under orders from editors to get the picture or bust. Prominent Americans in the United States who have been awaked from sleep by transatlantic telephone calls from London editors at the beginning of their working day—early morning over here—will probably agree. It seems that Colonel Lindbergh never made the distinction between himself as a private person and one who has a public entity. Editors here claim that in the latter capacity he might have shown himself more accommodating, and that if he had, invasions of his personal privacy might not have happened. However that may be, it is certain that the air of mystery in which he habitually moves invariably rouses the hunting instincts of the average news photographer and reporter. To the question whether he will

enjoy any more privacy in England than he did here a London correspondent to the New York *Times* reports that the answer of Fleet Street is "No."

What Does the Public Want?

THese are the days when motion-picture critics, experts, and others are voting for the "bests" in their industry. These, however, are all a matter of opinion. A vote of another and sounder kind has just been tabulated. It is the actual vote of the public itself at the box office. The Quigley Publishing Co., which gets out *Motion Picture Herald*, *Motion Picture Daily*, etc., has just published its annual, "The Box-Office Checkup," in which the highest-money-making films are listed, as reflected each month at the box office. It is a vote depending on nobody's judgment, but on mathematics. The result is highly encouraging to those producers which gave the public what it wanted. It shows that the Legion of Decency was right in interpreting the public's desires as clean, wholesome entertainment, literary classics if well-enough done, intelligent dramatic offerings, the simple and homely story, the tuneful and handsome musical. Smut, sophistication, crime, overdone sex, are not what the public wants, according to the figures; and apparently the industry had a very prosperous year. Further proofs of this are the names that stand highest in the list of stars who made the most money for the exhibitors in their theaters: Shirley Temple and Will Rogers. So the Legion of Decency and the Production Code Administration were not such an experiment after all; they were based on a much sounder knowledge of what the public wants than was possessed by a few decadent writers and leaders in the industry who came very near wrecking it until we rescued it.

Te Deum's Author

WHEN we chanted this venerable melody at the close of yesteryear, we said: "Why, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, of course!" Old editions of the Roman Breviary entitled the "Te Deum": *Hymnus sanctorum Ambrosii et Augustini*: "Hymn of Saints Ambrose and Augustine." Pious belief had it that the hymn sprang into being the famous night when Augustine rose from the baptismal font, regenerated by Ambrose's saving hand. Such might still be our belief, were it not for the early Irish monks. As was shown by the learned Benedictine Dom Morin, writing in 1894, ten of the most ancient manuscripts containing the Te Deum, of which several are of Irish origin, attribute it to Nicetas, Bishop of Remesiana, in Dacia, near the end of the fourth century. From what is known of Nicetas, he was a missionary bishop, who enjoyed the great advantage of being equally at home in the Latin and Greek languages and cultures. Twice he came to Rome, in 398 and 402. What is more, he was the friend of that highly gifted Roman aristocrat and poet, St. Paulinus, and we happen to know a little about Nicetas from Paulinus' verses in his honor. Musically

inclined, Nicetas taught the sailors to sing hymns, so that even the whales had to listen to them, says Paulinus (*Audent Amen tremefacta cete*). After a while, however, people forgot about Nicetas in the general confusion, and Remesiana was confused with Rome, Nicetas with Nicetus of Trier. His memory lived only in far-off Ireland, which again, as the mother of faith and culture, preserved the truth that a barbarous world had forgotten. As a recent scholar has observed (*Documentation Catholique*, November 9, 1935), the great hymn still echoes with the eloquence and the doctrinal content of Nicetas' catechetical preaching, combined with poetic elegance.

The Term "Orthodox"

THE foreign dispatches last week told of the death of Photios II, "head of the Orthodox Eastern Church." The wording of the cable suggests an interesting question: Are we Catholics justified in speaking of the dissident churches as "orthodox"? The Primacy of Peter is a dogma of the Faith. The Eastern Churches reject it. How then can we apply to them a beautiful adjective which means that they are not heretical? When we call them orthodox, do we not necessarily imply that we ourselves are heterodox? And if we use the term out of courtesy, aren't we being unforgivably discourteous to our own Mother Church? Well, to answer that we have to go back to the Council of Chalcedon. It took place in the year 451; against a fearful heresy of the time it insisted that there were two natures in Christ. The heretics whom the Council condemned broke away and formed their own churches, thus roughly splitting the Christian world into two divisions—the Catholic Church and the Monophysite Churches. But here is the point: The Catholic Church at that time included not only the West but also the East. In other words, the patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem stood shoulder to shoulder with Rome against the Monophysites and they were just as orthodox as the Pope in this dispute about the natures of Christ. Six hundred years later, in 1054, the Great Schism occurred, the Eastern churches rebelled, and their schism, of course, got deeply colored with heresy concerning the Primacy. But though they are heterodox on this point, Constantinople and other churches still have the right to be called orthodox. When we Catholics call them by that name, we are distinguishing them, not from Rome, but from the numerous and powerful Monophysite communities of the East.

Manila Prepares Its Congress

NOW that the hectic days of the inauguration of the first President of the new Philippine Commonwealth are over, Catholics in Manila are beginning to think ahead to the Thirty-third International Eucharistic Congress in February, 1937, which is to be held there. How striking was the decision to hold the Congress is shown by the fact that the Islands are the only Catholic country in the Orient, and that this will be the first time that the Far East will have witnessed the astounding

scenes of faith that always accompany such occasions. In his inauguration speech President Quezon made it plain that he intended to govern by invoking God's assistance. At the Te Deum on the Sunday following, he gave the first proof that he meant his words by kneeling in the sanctuary of the Cathedral with his wife. A correspondent tells us that it reminded him of that Te Deum in St. Mary's church in Philadelphia attended by members of our Government in the dawn of our own independence. Thus the new Philippines began under the best of auspices. The Eucharistic Congress will seal that sacred promise.

Parade Of Events

DROPS and swallows colored the news. . . . Babies dropping three and four stories and feeling better afterward; girls swallowing toothbrushes; boys swallowing tin whistles; men gulping down false teeth; men swallowing small pieces of tin, iron, steel and glass, nuts, bolts and small tacks; these and other instances indicated, observers felt, a toughening of the race. . . . Heroic exploits thrilled the nation. Children rescuing burning dolls, boys dying for dogs, elderly ladies facing death to save cats, built up an emotional mosaic that moved hearts everywhere. . . . The growing contempt for State lines grew some more. A bull hit a man in New York and hurled him into New Jersey. . . . Science lunged forward toward a better life. A drug which improves the learning power of blind rats was discovered. . . . That insomnia may be completely overcome seems certain. A sheriff recently cured of insomnia slept soundly while thieves took his money and watch from under the pillow. . . . Animals were active. A chow dog engineered a stock crash by chewing certificates. . . . A black sheep got into Sing Sing and became the pet of men with convictions there. . . . The influence of numbers on lives was illustrated. Thieves stole eighteen bolts of cloth; arrested eighteen days later they got eighteen months. . . . Europe still suffered economically. An Austrian hangman had to have his alimony payments cut, his business had fallen off so badly. . . . In the musical world, a duel with violins was fought in Hungary. . . . The Christian New Year was honored in New York and throughout the country. Seeing the celebrations, uninformed visitors got the idea the United States was a Christian country.

AMERICA A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

PAUL L. BLAKELY
GERARD B. DONNELLY

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief
FRANCIS X. TALBOT
WILLIAM J. LONERGAN
Associate Editors
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

JOHN LAFARGE
JOHN A. TOOMEY

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone MEDallion 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

Whither Labor?

United Front; Fascism; Mexico

DAVID GOLDSTEIN

INTENSE is the battle going on within the Socialist movement of our country, the "united front" being the issue. The old guard in control of the Socialist party in New York State stands aloof from such a front while Norman Thomas, in control of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party, veers at an increasing pace toward the left. That is why "there were only a few isolated boos, which the Communist party does not condone," said the *Daily Worker*, when he debated with Earl Browder (who just returned from Moscow) on the question of a united front before 20,000 persons (three-quarters of them Communists) who paid admission to hear them recently in Madison Square Garden. Moscow had given orders to get together to fight Fascism and to be ready to turn a "capitalist war," if one takes place, "into a civil war."

While divided, as Norman Thomas says, merely in regard to tactics, these three main divisions of Marxianism are united in proclaiming with joy "the advance" made at the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor at Atlantic City. The interesting 880-page report of the proceedings just issued give evidence of causes for rejoicing, even though it was voted to expel Communists should they appear as delegates in an A. F. of L. convention or enter the unions the Federation dominates.

Much space is taken up in the proceedings to the question of industrial versus craft unionism. This moot question, which has been the cause of bitter controversy for many years within the ranks of organized labor, is not an easily solvable problem, for much can be said that is sound on both sides of the issue. The industrial union side has a fighting leader in John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, whose union has been organized for years along industrial lines, despite the protests of the carpenters, machinists, teamsters, and other unions who have demanded that men of those crafts in the mines should belong to their respective craft unions. The "front" is already united in defense of Lewis. Old guard, Normanists, and Moscowites—all—have put aside the vicious things they have said about Lewis and are behind him unitedly for industrial unionism. The reason is simple. Industrial unions will accelerate the coming of the revolution if the Socialists get control of the unions in the basic industries. Socialists have long ago decided for industrial unionism so that, in the event of war, the general strike may be easily utilized.

Again there is rejoicing among all divisions of the not yet "united front" at the passage of the following resolution: "No officer of the American Federation of Labor shall act as an officer of the National Civic Federation, or be a member thereof."

If asked why, the Socialist press replies: "It's an

agency devoted largely to baiting radicals" (*Leader*); "It's a union-baiting and Red witch-hunting outfit" (*Advance*). Lewis presented the resolution very likely to strike a blow at Matthew Woll, who assumed labor leadership of that organization after the death of Samuel Gompers, as the Constitution of the United Mine Workers Union (to which Green belongs) prohibited Green from taking Gompers' place therein. The inactivity of the National Civic Federation during the past few years would not otherwise warrant Lewis taking any notice of its existence.

No person whose opinion is worth serious consideration would believe that Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell, or Matthew Woll would accept membership in the National Civic Federation were it a "union-baiting" organization. John Mitchell, the most beloved and capable president the United Mine Workers of our country ever had, was forced out of the National Civic Federation, where as a paid officer he conducted the trade-agreement department, by the Socialists in the miners' union. It was done by Socialist leader Adolph Germer, while Mitchell was absent from the convention, who introduced a resolution declaring that no member of the United Mine Workers Union shall maintain membership in the National Civic Federation because it "preaches the identity of the interests of labor and capital" and is a "labor-baiting organization," so the Socialist press reported. If Gompers instead of Green were in the chair at the recent convention, there is good reason to believe that the resolution would have been defeated. As to the merits of the N. C. F., it is enough to say that America's most faithful and capable trade-union leaders have deemed affiliation with it of advantage to labor's cause.

Of course, the convention had "to take a crack at Mussolini," to use the words of one of the delegates. Resolutions were presented and adopted condemning Fascism in Italy, primarily because Mussolini had "smashed the union" that existed when he made his march on Rome. These anti-Fascist resolutions caused great joy among the Socialists of all brands, for the Duce put an end to the nefarious work of the Socialists in Italy and there is no chance of making headway with Marxism in that country so long as Mussolini keeps in command. It seems rather inconsistent for the American Federation of Labor to vote to go to the limit of its power in dealing with Communists, "to expel every Communist from the ranks of the organized labor movement," and at the same time to find fault with Mussolini for crushing that kind of unionism in Italy.

Germany was condemned by the convention for her "religious persecution," as she ought to be. It was also voted to continue the boycott of her goods. How much greater would have been the joy of Catholics if Mexico were included in the resolutions, if the injustice of depriving the natives across our Southern border of the

exercise of their right of conscience were part of the condemnatory action of the delegates?

But Mexico is not left out of the proceedings. She is mentioned twice therein. Not in the interest of gaining for her people the liberties that the A. F. of L. resolved to try and get for other humans, three to five thousand miles away. In the proceedings we learn that great was the delight of the A. F. of L. officials last summer when the notorious Morones of C.R.O.M. fame came on to Washington for a visit. To quote: "The Convention notes with interest the report of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. of the fraternal visit of brother Luis N. Morones, head of the Mexican Federation of Labor and Vice-President of the Pan-American Federation of Labor to Washington."

The irony of this has now become apparent. Plutarco Elias Calles was then in exile in Los Angeles. Early in December, he arrived back in Mexico City, to overthrow Cárdenas obviously. His companion in the airplane which carried him was—Luis Morones! Was there an understanding with A. F. of L. heads to assist in the restoration? There is much cause for suspicion, surely. It is worth noting that Mexican labor has largely deserted Morones, and gone over to the Red unions under Lombardo Toledano. Morones was undoubtedly counting on Calles to restore him. Whom was Calles counting on?

Whether or not there was an understanding, it is not out of place to ask where were the Bowens, Burkes, Dempseys, Dillons, Doyleys, Duffys, Feeneys, Fitzgeralds, Haggertys, Hogans, Kellys, Maloneys, McCarthys, McGrady's, McNamaras, Mulcahys, Reagans, Rooney's, Ryans, Tobins, and Walshes? Were they devoid of the understanding of what was being put over? Or were they asleep at the switch? Surely that brawny assemblage of "fighting Irish" had not lost their intestinal fortitude. Well, there they sat in the convention while the injustices imposed upon the unfortunate peoples thousands of miles away were being condemned and not one of them arose to move the addition of a clause to the resolutions in defense of their fellow-Catholics at their very door.

Action by the A. F. of L against Mexican tyranny is an obligation long due. The A. F. of L is not responsible for what is taking or has taken place in Italy, Germany, or the U.S.S.R., but the A. F. of L is responsible in great part for the reign of the tyrants in Mexico. Gompers told us in his "Seventy Years of Life and Labor" that it was "valuable information" received "under the protection of fraternal Masonic relationship" which he turned over to his brother Mason Woodrow Wilson that caused the rejection of Huerta and the recognition by the President of Carranza. It was the A. F. of L that boastfully declared that the refusal of munitions to Huerta and the giving of 5,000 rifles and 5,000,000 rounds of ammunition to Obregon was due to its action. It was the A. F. of L that assisted at the inauguration of Calles as President of Mexico, and Gompers said: "Calles I know to be a lover of humanity." And it is the A. F. of L that has recently given joy to the enemies of religion in Mexico, by safeguarding them from any condemnation.

Industrial and Craft Unions

REGINALD T. KENNEDY

THE resignation of John L. Lewis from the executive council of the American Federation of Labor is a logical aftermath of the fierce battle that was fought in the convention at Atlantic City. The conflict easily rivals, if it does not surpass, previous wars within the Federation. That it was not the mere catharsis that many had hoped is evidenced by the increasing antagonisms that are developing.

The fight was strictly one between the old guard and the rank and file. The former group was headed by Matthew Woll, W. L. Hutcheson (carpenters' union), Joseph Franklin (boilermakers), Daniel Tracy (electrical workers), and Arthur Wharton (machinists)—obviously all craftsmen. Heading the rank and file was the triumvirate of Lewis, Dubinsky, and Howard, representatives of industrial unions.

To understand the quarrel it is necessary to define in some manner the difference between an industrial union and a crafts union. Stating it simply, an industrial union is a union which embraces *all* the men engaged in the making of a *product*, such as automobile workers, miners, and rubber workers; a craft union is the organization according to the *process*, for example, bricklayers, carpenters, machinists, and so on.

With the growth of industry and the development of workers whose occupations hover between semi-skilled and unskilled work, the proponents of industrial unions claim that it is impossible to organize these along crafts lines, and, secondly, that it would be destructive of co-operation among fellow-workmen to segregate them into various unions. Few workers in modern industry are "skilled." Placed at a certain operation or part of a factory by their employers, they attain a proper proficiency at their particular task, but their removal by a lock-out or withdrawal by a strike would not seriously hamper the efficiency of the plant if other workers engaged in the manufacture of the same product, only in a slightly different task, remained at their posts. New, totally unskilled workers could be quickly instructed and within a short time would attain a reasonable efficiency in their work. Modern industrial conditions are such that although a clever, experienced man is preferred, nevertheless a novice can be used if the former is discharged or strikes. If an industry were organized along craft lines it would obviously be futile for one union in a plant to strike without the aid of the others. Their strike would not only be quickly broken but it would even be insignificant.

To seek cooperation among the different unions would be an impossible task. What opportunity would there be for a working agreement between the various crafts when in single crafts there is open warfare between factions?

Craft unionism also involves extra officers with their attendant salaries and offices. Industrial unionism calls for only one set of officials, the other duties being handled by the shop stewards whose remuneration for time lost

and effort spent is a percentage of collected dues. At present this point is largely neglected, but in the future it may conceivably be the greatest factor in favor of the vertical or industrial union.

The shop steward is elected directly by the men (the exception to this is in the newly formed union, when he is appointed by the organizer) and works side by side with them. In this he differs from the delegate. The steward not only knows the attitude, the hardships, and the desires of the men; he actually experiences them. He is the natural leader of his fellow-workers. Should he at any time be delinquent in his duties or misrepresent the position of his fellows, it is easy for them to remove him. A union, then, in which shop stewards would be numerous and powerful, would be a union truly expressive of the demands of the laborers. Simultaneously it would be practically free from corruption. Shop stewards sharing the emotions of sweating men are not so susceptible to bribery and conspiracy as white-collared delegates and officers. If one should be tempted his removal would be expeditious and not thwarted by threats of gangster tactics.

The second serious charge against craft unions, lack of cooperation, has already been partially treated. From labor's viewpoint the outstanding example was the Anaconda strike in Montana last summer. In the midst of a smelter workers' strike, involving 8,000 men, a craft union consisting of a small percentage of the total workers made a separate agreement with the employers and broke the strike. The craft union denied the charges of Thomas H. Brown, head of the smelters, at the Atlantic City convention, claiming that their union antedated the smelter union. The latter counter-charged that it was the successor of the Western Federation of Miners, which obtained Gompers' permission in 1911 to organize the miners on an industrial basis. In deciding the case the convention bowed under the claims of the industrial union but the example stands. The presence of two or more unions in one field or in the manufacture of one product under modern industrial conditions is disruptive of unity in the laboring ranks.

During the decline of unionism and the rise of the company union, employers who set up the latter organized their workers on industrial lines. It was good business. Although the scheme recognized distinct gradings in wages, it joined all the workers in one compact, solid body. It eliminated strife between groups and made the worker "company conscious" instead of "craft conscious." A better feeling that promoted efficiency and an *esprit de corps* grew among the workers. The employer knew that division meant dissension and he sought to purge his workers of it by means of the company union formed on industrial lines.

On the other hand, many employers now seek to have two or more unions in their plant if they recognize collective bargaining, and insist on recognizing each group or organization of workers that presents claims to them, refusing to deal with one sole union elected as spokesman by the majority. This method is known as proportional

representation and was sanctioned by President Roosevelt in the automobile agreement. Those employers who persist in their refusal to recognize an outside union continue their efforts to organize a "company [industrial type] union."

Yet the craft-union leaders jam their eyes shut and shout, "No, no, no." Their case was best presented by John P. Frey, Metal Trades Department. He pointed out the victories won for labor by the craft unions. No industrial unionists dispute these claims. What they do assert is that craft unionism is outmoded. Continuing his argument, Mr. Frey pointed out industrial unions that had failed, the American Railway Union, the Western Federation of Miners, and the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. But all of these unions had been formed at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the present century. To compare conditions then to those prevailing now is to ignore the very heart of the industrial union arguments. In those years modern industry had not taken the form that it now operates under. Industries such as steel, rubber, and automobile had not attained their modern efficient systems. To cling to the type of unionism suitable to those days is reminiscent of the radio character who says, "You can keep your car; I'll stick to my horse."

The most dramatic scene of the convention took place during the presentation of the rubber workers' case by William Thompson. The exchange of blows between John L. Lewis and William Hutcheson was indicative of the high tension that ran through the entire meeting. On all points the industrial group was smothered under. It was a field day for the old guard, but in making a Roman holiday of the fight they walked into the trap laid by the rank and file. Overcome by success, the craft unionists allowed themselves to be outmaneuvered by the "industrialists."

Prior to the convention the rank and file were of the opinion that their case was hopeless. Clearly they were outnumbered. But for some time the radicals had sought to obtain a clear statement of policy from the heads of the A. F. of L. At the previous convention the old guard had equivocated by partially sanctioning Federal unions with reservations. This was unsatisfactory to Lewis and to the progressives in the ranks. A clear-cut policy was wanted. Was the A. F. of L. to continue in the old beaten track of the horse-and-buggy days or was it to develop along modern lines?

The answer was fully provided at the convention. The rank and file are disgusted with the office-holding, stuffed shirts of the old guard who since the passage of Section 7a have allowed company unions to develop almost as quickly as trade unions, who "after fifty-five years of activity" have organized "only 3,500,000 out of 39,000,000 of the nation's wage earners," who have allowed gangsterism to prevail in certain unions and who are all too ready to hurl the epithet of "Red" at every dissenter. There is a seething revolt among the wage earners who have been educated along industrial lines and who see clearly that craft unions will only lead to strife and di-

vision. The condition has been well expressed by Harvey Fremming: "Yes, we can kick them out of our union, but we cannot kick them into a craft union. More likely they will do the very thing we don't want—and no honest trade unionist would want—join the company union or the Communists."

John L. Lewis, with more foresight than his confrères, has resigned from the executive council to step out in the van of the industrial movement. He intends, apparently, to form a bloc within the A. F. of L. for the promotion of vertical methods. It was clearly impossible for a strong labor movement to develop from a Federation that insisted on according primacy to skilled workers when the vast bulk of workers are semi-skilled or unskilled.

Furthermore, from the rank-and-file viewpoint, the controlling group has been too compromising and moderate with the employers. The dissemination of liberal and progressive views by the intellectual leaders

of the nation has affected the laboring class. A mere living wage no longer suffices. Shorter working hours, unemployment and old-age insurance, profit sharing, and a participation in management, are the arguments finding weight with the union man. To the rank and file the old guard are old-fashioned and out of date. New men, new blood, new ideas are demanded, nothing less.

It is unlikely that the craft unions will recede from their position. Their leaders will surely fight to hold their offices. On the other hand, the rank and file is in no mood for a compromise. The battle to follow will be bitter and destructive. Labor does not benefit by such a cleavage. Temporarily a setback will ensue in some crafts. Industrial unionism should prevail, however, with the rank and file in their present mood. From labor's viewpoint it is to be hoped that the battle will be decisive with one group emerging completely victorious. The present cleavage is harmful but dualism would be fatal.

A New Catholic Youth Movement

BONAVENTURE SCHWINN, O.S.B.

FROM Paris comes the news that Vice Postulator Canon Mugnier has gone to Rome with documents to introduce the cause of beatification of Anne de Guigne, descendant of St. Louis, King of France. She was born at Annecy in Savoy in 1911 and died "in the odor of sanctity at the age of eleven." The arresting fact about Anne, of course, is her age. Hers is another name to add to the steadily growing list of children who have died within the last few years with all the marks of sanctity. Perhaps somebody ought to publish a "Who's Who of Child Candidates for Beatification," which would contain, besides Anne de Guigne, such names as these:

Fontgalland, Guy de, "Angel of the Eucharist," b. Paris, November 30, 1913; d. January 24, 1925, aged eleven; special virtues, simplicity and love for the Child Jesus; biography by Father Lawrence L. McReavy, 1932.

Filippetto, Maria, b. Padua, April 5, 1912; d. June 3, 1927, aged fifteen; special virtue, patient suffering for the love of God; biography by Father Benedict Williamson, 1930.

Martinez Herrera, Antónito, b. Santander, Spain, August 8, 1920; d. February 23, 1929, aged eight; special virtues, humility and charity; biography by Father Benedict Williamson, 1933.

Wang, Marie Thérèse, "Rose of China," b. April 1, 1917; d. February 24, 1932, aged fifteen; convert from paganism; biography by Dom Basil Stegmann, 1934.

Here are a little French girl and a little French boy, an Italian girl and a Spanish boy and a Chinese girl—all of them likely candidates for the honors of the altar. With their wide divergence of nationality, they are at once an argument for the catholicity and the sanctity of the Church. Besides their holiness of life they have another striking quality in common: their extreme youth. Are the saints of God being recruited from the nursery?

Little boy and girl saints are no new phenomenon in the Church. Some of the most popular saints, whose names are borne by thousands, have died very young. St.

Agnes, for example, suffered martyrdom at the age of twelve or thirteen. St. Stanislaus Kostka died at the age of seventeen. St. Lucy won the double crown of virginity and martyrdom at twenty. St. John Berchmans was only twenty-two when he died. St. Aloysius was twenty-three. And St. Gabriel of the Sorrowful Virgin was twenty-four. Practically in our own day, we have the example of the lovely Little Flower, St. Thérèse of the Child Jesus. Born January 2, 1873, she died September 30, 1897, when she was twenty-four. And she was canonized May 17, 1925, twenty-eight years after her death. There are many people living today who would be older than this canonized saint if she were still living in our times.

All these youthful saints witness to the fact that sanctity is primarily a matter of Grace and that it depends more upon God than upon man. It is not like ordinary human achievements, the learning of a science, for example, or the mastery of some art, to be attained only by a lifetime of close application and patient labor. But while it is undoubtedly a fact that sanctity at any age is mostly a matter of Grace, it is also true that on the human side certain dispositions or qualities are required that Grace may produce the fine flower of sanctity. And these qualities are characteristic of children perhaps more than of grown people, who have gradually, and more or less unconsciously, lost them, and who have even ceased to realize their importance. As Cardinal Newman says somewhere, alas, what are we doing all our lives long but forgetting life's poetry and learning its prose!

Some of the qualities that give childhood its charm and make children so lovable and attractive to older people are innocence, simplicity, humility, generosity, and romantic enthusiasm. When these childhood virtues have been supernaturalized by the action of Divine Grace the

result is what appears to be precocious sanctity. There is no reason for wonder, then, that there are so many child saints, like

daffodils
That come before the swallow dares, and take
The winds of March with beauty.

Wordsworth, perhaps better than anyone else, describes the heavenly provenance of children in his "Ode on Intimations of Immortality," in the passage which begins:

Trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy!

Childhood is the age of innocence. And this innocence is not merely the absence of sin. Like Grace, it is a positive quality that lights up the soul and shows it to be what it really is, the image and likeness of God. A painting that has been marred or a statue that has been broken may be restored, but it will never be quite the same. And a garden that has been ravaged by a storm may bloom again, but it will have lost something of its first delicate beauty.

Simplicity is closely related to innocence. Commonly disdained by the worldly wise, it rates high in the supernatural order. It implies singleness of purpose and direct action. And the simplicity of the dove is often the highest kind of wisdom. It is like the nostalgic flight of the homing pigeon. When the Little Flower was only three years old, her mother wrote of her:

What a queer little thing baby is! She kissed me the other day, at the same time telling me she wished I would die. "Oh, how I wish you would die, my darling mother!" I scolded her, but she replied, with an air of astonishment: "It is because I want you to go to heaven, and you said that we must die to go there." In her outbursts of affection she expresses the same wish for her father.

Humility is a rare virtue, but it is found in children. The ugly cockle of pride has not yet begun to grow in them. Was it because of the beauty of their humility that Our Lord was so fond of children and that He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not. For of such is the kingdom of God"? (Mark x, 14.) Or was it because He remembered that He Himself was once a little Boy?

The young man in the Gospel to whom Our Lord counseled poverty as a condition of perfection but who went away sad, "for he had great possessions," must have been, as the Gospel calls him, a man rather than a boy. He was old enough to have become attached to his riches, possessed by them. Young children are apt to be generous. They are detached, because they have not yet fallen under the tyranny of things. Naive and ingenuous, they are unspoiled by the cautious wisdom which teaches their elders to count the cost—although God never counts the cost in His dealings with men. What children can give to God is their affections, tenderly and generously. It is an offering of rose buds, and although a rose bud may not be more beautiful than a full-blown rose, it has not been used before. And where God finds wholeheartedness and gay generosity, instead of hardness and practicality, He lavishes His Graces, for He loves a cheerful giver.

Children are naturally romanticists, and the world in which they live is much more marvelous than the world of older people. It is a glorious and enchanted place, where one chicken feather is enough to make a wild Indian and a rain puddle will do for sailing a galley across the Atlantic. Father is the strongest, the smartest, and the most wonderful man in the world, and mother is not only the sweetest and dearest but also the most beautiful lady that has ever lived. Every little girl is Alice in Wonderland, and every little boy is Jack the Giant Killer. For youth is the golden age,

When all the world is young, lad,
And all the trees are green;
And every goose a swan, lad,
And every lass a queen!

Sir Galahad found the Holy Grail, but it was lost again. St. George slew his dragon, but there are many dragons in the world. St. Joan led her shining army, but there are other armies in need of leadership. And when it comes to high adventuring, far countries to be visited, and battles to be fought, what is so romantic for the child of Grace as the quest of heaven?

Childhood is full of ardors and ecstasies, and burns with a bright enthusiasm. Life is to be lived intensely, with dash and gusto.

If we wish to scale Mont Blanc [says Stevenson in "Crabbed Age and Youth"], or visit a thieves' kitchen in the East End, to go down in a diving dress or up in a balloon, we must be about it while we are still young. It will not do to delay until we are clogged with prudence and limping with rheumatism, and people begin to ask us: "What does Gravity out of bed?"

For some children the world is merely full of fairies. "You see, Wendy, when the first baby laughed for the first time, the laugh broke into a thousand pieces and they all went skipping about, and that was the beginning of fairies." But for other children the world is full of angels. Some, like Cinderella, have only a fairy godmother. But others have the Blessed Virgin. Some would like to imitate Jack, who climbed up to the sky on a bean stalk, while others are daring enough to aspire to go to heaven without such aid.

The natural qualities of childhood are not merely quixotic weaknesses, for when the dew of Grace falls upon them they become a fertile soil for sanctity. Some of the adult saints seem, like Peter Pan, never to have grown up but have displayed these qualities to a marked degree. There is St. Francis of Assisi with his generous giving for the love of God, with his talking to his brothers, the birds, and with his romantic invasion of the Moslem camp at the peril of his life to convert Melek-el-Kamil, the Sultan of Egypt. St. Anthony of Padua preaching to the fishes shows a kindred spirit. There is St. Philip Neri with his irrepressible playfulness. And there is St. Paul, whose gallant enthusiasm for the cause of Christ burning ever brighter carried him through dangers and persecutions on land and sea and finally to his death. It seems that they understood what Our Lord meant when He said, "Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew xviii, 3.)

Young Communists

THOMAS J. DIVINEY

THREE thousand boys and girls, young men and women, pulling and pushing with the enthusiasm of a crowd at a college football game; that was the scene outside the recent New York meeting of the Young Communist League. Three-thousand right arms upraised, elbows bent and fists clenched, their owners singing loudly and boldly, "The International Soviet shall be the human race": such was the picture inside the doors. The occasion was the welcome to the American delegation to the Sixth World Congress of the Young Communist International.

The meeting was a young people's meeting. More than seventy per cent were less than twenty-five years old and practically all the others were not more than thirty. All the enthusiasm and interest of young people in a vital cause was on display. A large band played martial tunes before the meeting began. Then as young workers and students, "comrades all," crowded the hall to capacity, the speaker of the evening was introduced by a young colored lad who acted as chairman. The spirit of Communism radiated the place and all present filled the description, "young comrades striving to become young revolutionists."

The speaker of the occasion, the main personage for whom the welcome was being tendered, was the short, dark, young radical, Gil Green, Secretary of the Young Communist International. The microphone before him on the stage carried his voice to the farthest ends of the hall, while he gave his report of the delegations' attendance at the Sixth World Congress of the Y. C. I.

It was far from being a stereotyped report such as is customarily read by secretaries at public gatherings. Six-thousand ears listened attentively to every word, and it was clear to be seen that the audience followed page for page and line for line, by the immediate response with which the statements of the speaker were met. Names such as Hearst, Rockefeller, and Morgan were greeted with jeers, boos, and hisses. The secretary's reference to capitalism and its failure to meet the needs of youth also brought down the denunciation of the crowd. But when the speaker outlined the plans for the uniting of American youth, and the enlistment of 50,000 in the ranks of a great American youth congress by 1937, the cheering and rounds of applause were deafening.

All the complaints and ills of youth, real or fancied, were detailed at length. Mr. Green pointed out that an analysis of the position of the youth in the capitalistic world had been made at the recent congress. One could not help wondering what thoughts were coursing through the minds of the young people present, as it was pointed out to them in strong language that they are "an unwanted generation"; that they have "no opportunities"; that "students coming out of schools find the professions filled"; that "discrimination against Negro youth is worse than before"; that "youth on the farm has no prospects for the future"; that these and worse conditions

and darker prospects are the only outlook of the young generation in America, the wealthiest country in the world.

There is certainly no doubt about the fact that the young people present are real Communists. This was apparent from their reaction to the laudatory things the speaker called to mind about Lenin, Stalin, and Dimitrov.

While their watchword, according to statements made, is that youth be saved from Fascism and imperialistic war, the whole attitude of those present was one completely in line with the use of force if necessary to obtain what they conceive to be their rights.

"Let the working classes apply their own sanctions," said the speaker, in critically commenting upon the actions of the League of Nations and of the United States in regard to the present Italian-Ethiopian conflict. In other words, let the workers revolt here at home if necessary. This, according to the young Communists, would stop Mussolini and serve as a warning to Germany and Japan.

Young Communists indict the present Administration with attempting to reconcile youth with the decline of capitalism. They charge that the regimentation of youth in the CCC organizations and the establishment of the National Youth Administration are but attempts on the part of capital to provide an antidote. "Therefore, it is our belief," said Green, "to unite in one great youth organization all young people who are against Fascism no matter to what church, sect, or party they belong."

Second-hand copies of a large magazine with the letters in bold type USSR were being sold at the meeting. Long tables, containing all types of printed and mimeographed matter, books, and pamphlets, were set up at the rear of the hall; Communistic songs were sung in which all took part with as much spirit as one might expect in the rendition of a school song or a college cheer. The greatest enthusiasm followed the announcement of a possible amalgamation with the Young Peoples' Socialist League. Speakers from that organization were present and invited to the platform. The plan of the young Communists is to bring into the new youth organization such young peoples' groups as church societies and "Y" organizations. They claimed considerable encouragement in this direction by virtue of a progressive platform adopted by the Methodist Youth Conference. A Lutheran minister was quoted as saying "that the main bulwark supporting peace, culture, and progress is the Soviet Union."

While plans under way provide for the mass education of youth (in Communistic principles), greater developments in the struggle for Negro rights and the inculcation of the Communistic spirit in all the youth of the country, some difficulties are anticipated on the question of religion. A solution to that problem is proposed by Mr. Green. He says: "Many religious youth were skeptical about uniting with Communists, although they were against Fascism, because they feared that this was a trap to force our atheist views upon them. This problem was solved by simply agreeing to permit all the religious youth in the congress to hold church services Sunday morning. This did not compromise the Communist youth and yet

showed to the masses of religious youth that this was not a united front against religion, but against political reaction."

It is the intention of the young Communists to place an ardent worker in each of the groups or societies of young people and thus incite them to demand their rights.

How education and development of the Communistic principles in the minds of young people can go hand in

hand with the practice of religion was not explained—perhaps because there is no explanation. A fair appraisal of the utterances of the Young Communist International secretary and the attitude of his anxious listeners, point to a strenuous effort on the part of Soviet Russia to gain a foothold in the United States. The challenge by these "Reds" throws down the sword to the youth of America who believe in God and country.

Education

Is Liberal Learning in Peril?

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.

LIKE all educational innovations that have been designed to make life more useful and the battle of life more shock proof, the rapidly multiplying junior college is almost sure to make a destructive dent in the fulness of modern education. It has come, perhaps to stay, perhaps to make way for some new time-saving and study-saving scheme. But stay or go, it seems at the present moment to be threatening the very foundations of that time-tried structure called liberal education.

Here played a tiger, rolling to and fro
The heads and crowns of kings.

And the wonder of it is that the heads and crowns of the ancient kingdom of liberal arts appear to care little that their boundaries have been overrun and their territories diminished, that they are being rolled about by the desecrating paws of utilitarian educationists and sacrilegiously clawed into unresisting oblivion. Is this unwarranted pessimism? Perhaps we had better look the animal in the eye and see precisely wherein lies his threatening attitude.

Someone has said that a liberal education consists of a knowledge of those things that befit a free man. They constitute a gentleman's knowledge and immediately provoke the query: "What knowledge befits a gentleman?" Well, there's art and architecture, music and literature, philosophy and mathematics. They were the quadrivium and trivium of Aristotle and Tullius, of Thomas and Newman. They represent the store of learning of the world's great men; they were the perfections that adorned the noble souls of Iberians, Spaniards, Gauls, Thracians, Macedonians, all who were formed on the pattern of Rome and Athens.

But the Christian world is a different sphere and the modern Catholic world is still another step removed from the ancients. It has in its favor the traditions of an enduring Catholic culture; it has its own standards and its own peculiar educational practice resting on the solid footings of humanism and Scholasticism, with a generous super-imposition of the social sciences. Whether or not we appreciate how great a factor the philosophy of the Schoolman has been in forming and maintaining the current concept of Catholic liberal education is beyond the scope of these few lines. Nor is it necessary to show how it is being affected by the two-year college plan, for in most non-Catholic colleges Scholasticism is ignored

entirely or else considered an antiquated system of thought.

Humanism, which the Church took unto her own long before the Renaissance, has been, and should remain, the darling of Catholic educators. A thousand years before Erasmus there were humanists of a genuine sort spreading culture from Ireland. Before Charlemagne there was humanism beyond the Alps and in persecuted Africa. Another name for it, as given in Webster's, is "polite learning," and still another "the study of the humanities, especially of the ancient classics."

All this seems a far cry from the junior college and its threat against liberal education but actually it is not. Humanism and Scholasticism—or any thorough system of philosophy for that matter—stand in the way of quick results; and who will deny that every barrier of such a kind must fall under the sacrificial knife of efficiency? With philosophy a nonentity, and humanism gradually losing ground, there remain only the so-called "social sciences" to provide the general rounding out that constitutes a liberal education. The old order disappears and the new is concerned chiefly with scientific methods and expediencies. Only too well did Dr. Meiklejohn, when President of Amherst, voice the fact that "the most striking weakness of the American college today is that it is a thing of shreds and patches with little pretensions of design or purpose." If the two-year plan comes into wide vogue there will probably be more shreds and smaller patches and no design at all.

The function of the junior college is manifold, and the reasons of its existence almost as numerous. The outstanding cause for its popularity is the present desire to get over the prerequisites for professional training as quickly as possible. This function, however, which writers in the field of education have been pleased to call the "isthmian" is not its only function, so that the two-year college must not be confounded with pre-medical or pre-legal schools. At this point of its development it is in reality neither flesh nor fish nor fowl; it is neither high school nor college nor university.

When considered in its position on the educational ladder it would best be called a senior high school, but inquiring into its actual status, we find that it is attempting to fill the gap between high school and university, taking the place, in a modest and unsatisfying manner, of the established liberal-arts college. It breaks once again

that which had been broken several decades when high school and college began to function separately. It stunts of two years' growth the life of liberal learning whose progress should not be interrupted even by the high school-college break, and whose progress cannot be interrupted without resulting in disorganized education. Long experience of Catholic educators has shown that expediency must frequently be regarded as necessity, that plans, such as the two-year college course, must at times be accepted and utilized, but it has never shown that these changes are improvements upon, or aids to, liberal learning. As a matter of truth, the shorter college course threatens not only to disorganize the Catholic cultural traditions but also to curtail it.

Another reason that sponsors of the plan give for the formation of two-year colleges is found on the title page of one of their annual catalogues. "You can finance a trip to Europe on the savings effected by attending junior college." For this the junior college must be blessed. Not, indeed, that it gives one a trip to Europe, but, because of its economical functioning, it brings some opportunity for higher learning within the purse strings of the poorer student and despite axioms to the contrary, a little learning is better than no learning. Perhaps the opening vista will lead him on to higher aspirations, and in the case of Catholic junior colleges, a local opportunity is presented to the serious student who could not otherwise continue his Catholic education. In his case the curtailed course is an absolute boom. Talking of higher education, thus, in terms of dollars and cents is talking of incompatibles, but, sad to admit, we are only too often forced to consider that angle.

Also in regard to its economy of operation, the quickly multiplying junior college is of some assistance in the present unemployment situation insofar as it can delay for two years the descent of hordes of high-school graduates upon business offices. On the other hand the objection may be raised that it is not really economical for the great mass of people because, where it is a part of the public-school system, there is an added burden thrust upon the municipality.

But to return to the original and important objection. There has been much complaint on the part of job seekers in recent years because of the insistence of every kind of business and profession, that beginners should have more "education." Prerequisites have steadily mounted so that undertakers and salesmen, ordinary seamen and filing clerks, mailmen and police, must have had more schooling to "get the job." But the sort of training demanded here is almost antipodal to the accepted concept of liberal learning. Now if we step up to the professions, law and medicine, for instance, we find this same insistence on prerequisites taking the opposite turn. Formerly the aspirant to the "professions" accepted it as a matter of course that he would first finish his four-year course in the liberal arts; but now more and more often does the medical school reach down to the undergraduate, and the schools of law, of dentistry, of engineering, of pharmacy, are content if their students bring with them credits

—magic phrase!—for two scant years of general learning.

All this means that the student begins to specialize before he is sufficiently equipped, and thus defeats the end of liberal education. If he consumes his time in preparing for life, when will he prepare for the *art* of living? What preparation will he have for life's disasters, for situations such as have occurred in the last half-decade? The answer lies in the solid grounding of Catholic liberal education. It alone has the answers to the problems of life, it alone can give the antidote against men who

at random shower down upon their hearers ingenuities and novelties, or . . . teach even what has a basis of truth in it, in a brilliant, off-hand way, to a collection of youths, who may not perhaps hear them for six consecutive lectures, and who will carry away with them into the country a misty idea of the half-created theories of some ambitious intellect.

In a word, they will not be "taken in."

Sociology

On Rediscovering the Constitution

WILLIAM F. KUHN

IN promoting the general welfare, the United States Government is not directed in so many words to subscribe to any social legislation, or to promulgate class legislation, but to expend its powers upon a just distribution of its protection to all. The manner of this distribution is the point so vividly to be contested, possibly, in the approaching general elections. At least, that point will be the concern of political battle-cries. Yet, neither party is in position to assert age-long devotion to the Constitution. That attribute belongs not to attitudes, but to deeds.

That sectionalism would be the backbone of Congress was recognized as far back as 1788, when Madison wrote:

The prepossessions which the members (of Congress) themselves will carry into the federal government will generally be favorable to the States; while it will rarely happen that the members of the State governments will carry into the public councils a bias in favor of the general government. . . . For the same reason that the members of the State legislatures will be unlikely to attach themselves sufficiently to national objects, the members of the federal legislature will be likely to attach themselves too much to local objects. ("Federalist" No. 55.)

It is likewise true that party affiliation might attach members of Congress too much to partisan policies. Despite this, we may be interested in the fervent pleas to the electorate in the coming campaign to "save the Constitution" on the one hand, and to "modernize the Constitution" on the other. Some, in their fervor to be saviors, will be, as John Wiltby says, "determined to be sot," and those on the opposite side just as "sot" on having it their way. Politics thus overlooks what might be a constructive attitude, and thus would rather be President than right.

Instead of being constitutional or anti-constitutional, it would be well if the general run of us knew what we were talking about first. More than ever before, attention and study is being devoted to the perusal of that document

upon which our political, social, and economic life in great part depends. It behooves us, therefore, after a rest of some seventy years, to look up the pages of the musty volumes which contain the provisions of the Constitution, and to renew our acquaintance with the thoughts of those who made it. Rather than take sides immediately on the question of political benefactions which would flow from either saving or destroying, or even amending, the Constitution, why not study the documents which throw light upon it?

In 1787 there was held a convention in which an aggregate of fifty-five men, well thought of in their respective communities, and in the forefront of their respective professions, applied their knowledge, tact, and intellect in the forming of a new government. From a consideration of the events which surrounded them, and their own interests as well as the interests of the country at large, we get the first knowledge of the Constitution they conceived. It was a compromise, based on necessity and the protection of human rights. It is to be noted that security for property and personal liberty were part of the objects of the making of the Constitution, and that these objects were attained at that time by it.

The mad wrangling of the debtor classes previous to the Constitutional Convention infringed upon the rights of human beings and their interests in property. Not too recently, but within short memory, the overbearing economic debtor classes, large corporations faced with the necessity of paying dividends have failed to meet their obligations and collapsed, carrying with them investors, foolish and wise together; the small personal debtors increased until they reached the tremendous numbers of that great "under-privileged" class. These, unable to pay their own small debts, have fallen on the government for support, while the corporations cry that excessive legislation makes them unable to re-employ and forces them to "retrench."

This may have been more true six months ago, but essentially the matter is that those who once had a little, are now paying more for the privilege of holding less. The thrifty, the saving, the small "capitalist," shop keeper, professional man, or skilled mechanic, is hard pressed. So was he prior to the adoption of the Constitution, not in the same manner or degree, but in the same kind. His rights were abused in 1788 by riots, inter-State taxation, depression; in 1935 his rights were abused by strikes, Federal taxation, State taxation, depression.

There is not so great a difference between those difficult times and these as to make us change completely the form of correction which was then applied. An indication of what we need may be found in Supreme Court Justice Samuel F. Miller's remarks made in Philadelphia, September 17, 1887, almost half a century ago:

I should fail of a most important duty if I did not say . . . that no amount of wisdom in a Constitution can produce wise government, unless there is a suitable response in the spirit of the people.

This suitable response can come only through knowl-

edge. The opportunity is at hand to learn. But politics may obscure that chance in the pyrotechnics of sentiment and absurd charges of political default and depredation.

Only recently a committee of outstanding lawyers, representative of the best of the Bar and men in public life, entered into a study of the present administrative legislative measures, in order to give an opinion as to their constitutionality. It is indeed surprising that the Bar did not see this need previously. What greater security, outside the consent of the Supreme Court itself, could an Administration have of the constitutionality of its measures, than the approval of such a standing committee? What a better chance of forging constitutional bills there would be, if such a committee should be a guide!

If this committee would look into the sources of our knowledge of the meaning of the Constitution, arrange them, explain them, set them forth clearly, logically, with their limitations on both State and Federal Governments, we would have progressed in general education, and in the education of politicians and members of Congress along the lines of the science of governing constitutionally. It is unquestionably the time to delve into the past to find out whether the meaning of the Constitution is clearly enough outlined by this date to be wrought into a compact body of explanation. All Supreme Court decisions, all pre-Constitutional interpretations, the explanations and decisions in all the historical movements and debates can be taken within this committee's field, and be explored, deciphered, and explained. There are differences, it is true, but a capable, non-partisan body of representative lawyers and historians might arrive at a conclusion well worth their while.

Consequently, why waste time trying to "save" or "change" that about which we know so little? We should first learn about it, and then act upon our knowledge. Instead of being "sot," let us be critical, but fair minded, open to discussion, and willing to learn. If we are to progress in either intellectual stature or moral growth, we must naturally drop sectionalism, and remember Madison's observations. If we must be national minded, let us be so minded as to take in the best interests of the individuals of the nation, and not of those who control the nation. After all, since universal suffrage gave the common man the power to run the Government, each in his own little way, let us make it our business to know something of the Government we support financially. We should get the benefit of good government, by having it work for us. It was made for that purpose, and it can be made to serve that purpose, as it once did.

Although in promoting the general welfare of the United States, the Government is not directed in so many words to formulate social legislation, it surely lies within its power constitutionally, and it is up to the public to educate itself to the point of demanding such constitutional action. On the part of this legal committee, or a similar committee which would have the non-partisanship desire to scrutinize the Constitution for the benefit of the country, it seems that it should bring together all the data on

the meaning of the provisions in the Constitution, and publish their findings, so that those who pay for the governing of the country may be informed as to how it should be run, and thus be enabled in a manner to know who should know how to run it.

"Rules are not necessarily sacred—principles are." Political rules of the game should go by the board in times of stress. Principles, those which made and gave vitality to the Constitution, should always hold their place. In recent years they have been forgotten, or disregarded. It is now the time to rediscover the Constitution of the Fathers.

With Script and Staff

IN the beginning of the year, Father Jude makes an exception to his rule of avoiding discussion of financial matters from the pulpit. "Indeed," he remarks, "I say so little during the year about church support that the congregation appear to labor under an impression that they may forget their own duties in that regard. I wonder if I am not trusting a little too much to their sense of the fitness of things." At any rate, some time around the turn of the year Father Jude engages in his task with uncommon solemnity. No off-hand announcement; nor yet harangue. But an invitation, as it were, for all to meditate upon what the year's budget means as a whole, and in detail.

"How much detail?" is my impertinent question.

"There," says Jude, "is the question. Do not misunderstand me. Minus self-gratulation, I can frankly say that my hesitation as to details arises from anxiety lest I be found spending too much upon myself or any unworthy objects. It is rather that so much has gone from the parish to the Church Universal during the past year, e.g., to the missions, home and foreign, not to speak of other non-parochial causes nearer home, that I fear the congregation will not understand, and will believe that their own House of God is being neglected."

"Will they recognize, for instance, in December the mood that they enjoyed in August, when they were swept off their feet for the new bamboo hospital in the Little Manhattan Islands, as Msgr. Van Den Grootebart told them that story of the poisoned arrows in the soup? 'Ah me!' they will say to me now: 'Father Jude, need we not some of that cash for subduing the splutterings and hammerings of our heating system?' However, it is a training for both pastor and people. I can be more frank, and they are better informed. This year I laid all my cards on the table, and I believe they will match them in their generosity."

SPEAKING on December 30 at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Edward L. Thorndike, retiring president of the Association, propounded the idea that the "soul" of the nation might be analyzed by a study of its spending

habits, which is an old and familiar notion to Father Jude, though applied within the limits of his own jurisdiction. According to Dr. Thorndike;

When the entire annual budget is transferred, item by item, into a budget for the satisfaction of human wants, the payments for sensory pleasures, security, approval of others, and the pleasures of companionship and sociability, including romance and courtship, are in each case close in magnitude to the amount paid for freedom from hunger.

In fact, we pay more to maintain self-respect and the good opinions of others, and to avoid scorn, derisions, and shame, than to keep our bodies fed and free from the distress of hunger.

We pay more for entertainment (including the intellectual pleasures and the sensory pleasures of sight, sound, taste, and smell) than for protection against cold, heat, wet, animals, disease, criminals, and other bad people, and pain.

Dr. Thorndike translated, by his own plan of analysis, the spending items into human wants and desires, with the following result, presented not in details, but in samples:

Food—56 per cent to satisfy hunger; 15 to gratify the pleasures of taste and smell; 10 for the pleasures of companionship and social intercourse, including courtship; 3½ for the approval of others, and smaller percentages for protection against disease and cold, enjoyment of the comfort of others, and the pleasures of vision.

The various aims implied in the purchase of clothes, on which we spend \$8,000,000,000 annually; of cosmetics and beauty parlors which take a toll of \$700,000,000; and so on, were likewise analyzed. Anyone can do it for himself, as in a matter like automobiles (\$6,500,000,-000 per annum), tobacco (\$1,500,000,000 annually), death and burial (\$750,000,000), etc.

I have no brief for Dr. Thorndike's method of analysis. Still less for his relativism in the matter of ethics. Nor does he claim his analysis to be more than tentative. He does, however, point out to the biologist and psychologist brethren that their emphasis on material wants, such as food, housing, relief from material care and fatigue, has obscured their minds to the fact that people are as willing to pay large sums of money for "inner peace, contentment, a sense of personal worth, surety of friendship and affection, the absence of fear, the presence of a good conscience, and other states of mind."

It is just this fact which the Bolsheviks find perplexing as the millions who are being sedulously educated by them in the gospel of pure materialism begin to show preferences in the manner of spending their money. Christmas decorations are meaningless from their own standpoint. Yet this Christmas the capitalistic "masses" were more than ordinarily spontaneous in their bursts of trees, lights, decorations, carols, cantatas, pageants and other manifestations of that spirit which is associated with the Birth of the Saviour. Lest the doctrinaire principle be foiled, the decree went out that young Marxians must be provided with "New Year's trees." An embarrassment is saved for the time being that would come if Soviet youth were to look longingly to the Christmas joys of other lands while Moscow was cold and dark.

A curious irony, however, still remains in the situation. Under the old Julian calendar, observed by the Orthodox

Church, Russia's Christmas, like its Easter, always dragged lamentably behind the rest of the Christian world. Gay Christmas cards came to Russians from abroad while in Petrograd or Moscow they were still plunged into Advent or Lenten fasts. The Soviet plan to substitute New Year's for Christmas preserves this time order. Even Lenin and Stalin cannot quite liberate the land from the clutches of the Old Calendarians. Palaeohemerology dies hard.

Dr. Thorndike believes that people can be educated to new desires, new wants. So does the Church, and finds therein the ultimate solution of budget problems. This again may make good matter for preacher and people during the coming year. And the Collects of the Sundays can furnish some texts.

THE PILGRIM.

Literature

Willa Cather as a Critic

CAMILLE MCCOLE

HE must have been a rather unimposing figure in those days when Cameron Mackenzie guided the destinies of *McClure's*. And Thomas Beer admits that, at least upon occasion, he found it possible to hate her intensely. For she was forever strolling up to Mackenzie's desk to interrupt the seventeen-year-old Beer's "adolescent diplomacies" just as he was about to extract five dollars from his editor for some Saturday afternoon show. The hour would wear on; it would be almost time for the show or concert to begin; and the "rosy young woman" would still be talking with the Old Man while a boy's entire afternoon hung in the balance. Usually, however, he got his five dollars—tossed to him, after the young lady's talk had ended, with Mackenzie's remark to the effect that "she writes better than Edith Wharton." And in the first decade of our century such a remark constituted words of praise, indeed. But of the young woman so complimented, Thomas Beer could think only that she made his Saturday afternoons unpleasant and that her name sounded absurdly unfamiliar.

Willa Cather's name is not unfamiliar today. But at least one phase of her work is, I find, hardly known at all. Readers of all her novels, from "Alexander's Bridge" to "Lucy Gayheart," are unaware, I believe, of the years of painstaking and penetrating thought which Willa Cather must have devoted to the formulating of a sound theory of criticism before she even essayed the writing of books. She must have laid the foundations of her art very well indeed during those years on *McClure's*: perhaps that is exactly why she stands out so uniquely among our writers in respect to the reticence she has always since maintained regarding her own theory and technique. When one has thought a great deal about how exactly to do a thing, you know, one does not have to talk before literary clubs or write articles on critical theory for the daily press! One becomes an artist and goes quietly on one's way.

With Willa Cather's way as a novelist I am not here concerned. I am, however, anxious to call attention to a

very brief critical essay which she once wrote—one which I think so profoundly suggests what is the basic weakness of almost all of our contemporary writing that it should be read through carefully by every living writer at least once a year. Students in creative-writing courses should be encouraged to put into practice its sound advice; and all of us who are bewildered by the fast flowing but murky currents of our letters, should go to it to reestablish our critical sanity. The title of her essay—I wager not many know of it—is "The Novel *Démeublé*." Readers will find that it is as poignant with meaning and as compact as any few pages of her fiction. And how applicable it is today!

Let me suggest its relevancy more specifically. All of us must be increasingly aware of the fact that our present literary tendencies point dangerously in the direction of mere journalese instead of genuinely artistic writing. About the whole question of the distinction which exists between these two forms of writing there exists nothing but the most deplorable critical confusion. And the confusion over exactly this problem is, to my way of thinking, responsible for so many unethical and inartistic (the two are more closely related than we suspect) books today. The journalist's mind and the mind of the truly imaginative artists, it must be conceded by now, are entirely dissimilar. The aims of the two are different. The talents of both are not of the same order. But we continue to speak—notice most of our reviews—of books as successful and "great" in proportion to the success which they achieve as pieces of merely good reporting. I think Miss Cather puts the matter rather well, however, when she reminds us: "If the novel is a form of imaginative art, it cannot be at the same time a vivid and brilliant form of journalism. Out of the teeming, gleaming stream of the present it must select the eternal material of art."

Any one who has attempted the difficult business of giving a course in creative writing will see at once, and very lucidly indeed, just how perniciously prevalent among our students are the misconceptions against which the author of "The Novel *Démeublé*" warns us. All the "How-to-Write-It" books emphasize verisimilitude almost to the total exclusion of suggestion. The student is told to write his sketch of Aunt Beulah or Miss Tippet in such a way that the reader will see just where Aunt Beulah and Miss Tippet are sitting, exactly what they look like, what they are doing (in unconscionable and painful detail), etc. He is to make use of the "ten" ways of developing Miss Tippet's character. He is to use the five methods of describing Aunt Beulah's front porch. He is to dig in countless volumes for descriptions of Miss Tippet's period costume. And he is to cultivate his powers of observation until he learns just *how* a woman like Miss Tippet would knit. (If necessary, he should himself learn how to handle knitting needles in order to achieve the desired verisimilitude.) In all probability he will *never* be taught that Aunt Beulah's front porch and knitting needles may just possibly not have *anything* to do with capturing that fleeting moment of loveliness or ecstasy or exquisite passion which he is actually trying

to suggest. His primary aim as an earnest artist he will overlook entirely. Miss Cather can tell him just what that aim should be:

Whatever is felt upon the page without being specifically named there—that, it seems to me, is created. It is the inexplicable presence of the thing not named, of the overtone divined by the ear but not heard by it, the verbal mood, the emotional aura of the fact or the thing or the deed, that gives high quality to the novel or the drama, as well as to poetry itself.

Let me carry my reflections further. As a result, perhaps of a literary diet upon the volumes of the majority of our writers, from Dreiser back in the first murky years of our century to, let us say, Saroyan in our own dubious decade, most of our critics seem to attach merit to that novel which succeeds in piling up the most staggering amount of factual description. Dreiser set the fashion with his period-furniture catalogues and expositions on the street railway system of Chicago. Our younger writers continue it with whatever catalogues and systems remain for them as substitutes for their thin and unimaginative efforts. But when she wrote "The Novel Déménagé" and commented as follows (upon what I take for granted is Dreiser's "The Titan"), surely Willa Cather might be said to have uttered words of sound criticism pertinent to, and prophetic of, a current which was then only in its beginnings:

Is the story of a banker who is unfaithful to his wife and who ruins himself by speculation . . . at all reinforced by a masterly exposition of the banking system, our whole system of credits, the methods of the Stock Exchange? Of course, if the story is thin, these things do reinforce it in a sense—any amount of red meat thrown into the scale to make the beam dip.

There exists among our contemporary writers and critics one final superstition for which I believe the study of Miss Cather's essay will serve as a potent antidote. She herself does more than hint at it when she reminds us that "a novel crowded with physical sensations is no less a catalogue than one crowded with furniture." Time and again, our critics insist that such and such a book is the "greatest" book of the year because it makes us actually *feel* the various physical sensations of its characters, the period about which it is written, etc. (Thus arises, for example, one of the confusions regarding the legitimate and artistic use of physical passion.) I myself have heard fairly intelligent readers defend D. H. Lawrence's laboratory analyses of sex and psychopathology on this ground with a fervor I am not sure they could have summoned for a defense of our Constitution: "D. H. Lawrence and his disciples are great novelists because they have succeeded in breaking down the old barricades of reticence regarding such subjects; and because they have shown us some of the complex 'nuances' and 'values' of physical sensation."

I used to attempt a sincerely unimpassioned answer to such statements. Now, I simply refer my friends to "The Novel Déménagé," in which Willa Cather, the critic, reminds us how vast a distance lies between emotion and mere sensory reactions. "Characters can be almost dehumanized by a laboratory study of the behavior of their bodily organs under sensory stimuli. . . . Can anyone imagine anything more terrible than the story of Romeo

and Juliet, rewritten in prose by Mr. Lawrence?" It is difficult to improve upon these words!

And it would be difficult to improve upon Miss Cather's entire essay. Mr. Knopf ought to reprint it in pamphlet form for distribution among all living writers, critics, and students in writing courses! Another generation might thus be at least partly spared our own generation's critical confusions. Our own young and beginning writers might come to disagree with that character in a recent novel who observed that she really didn't know *how* to write books, but that she felt a trip to Paris and a divorce were too good to be wasted!

I cannot resist one final quotation from Miss Cather's essay. "The elder Dumas enunciated a great principle," she observes, "when he said that to make a drama, a man needed one passion, and four walls." Are not too many of our living novelists merely builders of walls, without the great heart and one genuine passion to enclose therein?

A Review of Current Books

Old Craft Union

REVOLUTION AND FREEMASONRY, 1680-1800. By Bernard Fay. Little, Brown, and Company. \$3.00.

PROFESSOR FAY has written a lucid and stimulating work. In it, he carefully investigates the origin of Freemasonry and traces its history until the dawn of the nineteenth century. His learning, though deep, is combined with a witty and often brilliant style. His book is thoroughly documented, and the critical bibliography should prove a great aid to students pursuing further studies in this field. Dr. Fay writes with great objectivity. He reveals no bias for or against Masonry. His attitude towards the Church is sympathetic, but he is never unfair to her foes.

Freemasonry has been a hidden force in the history of the last two centuries. Through ignorance or design its influence is often distorted or utterly ignored. Taine does not allude to it in his *Origines de la France Contemporaine*. Our press seems utterly in the dark concerning its concealed but malign power in present-day France, Spain, and Latin America.

Dr. Fay traces with great clarity the spirit and objectives of eighteenth-century Masonry. From its cradle it was Deistic, naturalistic, "philosophical," and anti-clerical in its outlook. In England it supported the Hanoverian dynasty and harmonized with Anglican Latitudinarianism. In France up to 1789 it was not as a body revolutionary. It remained aristocratic and Voltairean in its political aspect. Yet from the start French Freemasonry sought to supplant the Catholic Faith with the religion of humanity and fostered the spread of Deism. Within the lodges an inner circle of adepts cherished even more subversive views; as always, the bulk of Masons were but pawns in the hands of the hidden rulers of the sect. The subsequent evolution of French Masonry towards militant atheism does not lie within Dr. Fay's field.

The author has composed a most fascinating chapter dealing with the influence of Masonry upon our own Revolution. Brother Franklin capitalized his standing in the Craft to gain French sympathy for American Independence, while La Fayette and Washington found in Freemasonry a bond of affection. Dr. Fay does not discuss the rise of Illuminism in Germany and its relations with Masonry. This is a gap in his masterly work.

This book is of vital moment for scholars who seek adequately to grasp the root causes of the French Revolution. Should Dr.

Fay continue his history of Masonry until our own day, he will lay upon students of modern history a debt of gratitude. In the English-speaking world Masonry remains loyal to its primitive Deistic traditions; it harmonizes well with liberal, semi-creedless Protestantism. But in Catholic lands it enters into all movements hostile to the Church and seeks to direct against her all political and social unrest. Latin Masonry has long been atheistic and subversive; it has become "La Contre-Eglise." It largely dominates the press, and poisons the wells of information. It is loyal to the maxim of Brother Voltaire: "Ecrasez l'infame."

LAURENCE K. PATTERSON.

Man of the Hour

BENEŠ: STATESMAN OF CENTRAL EUROPE. By Pierre Crabitès. London: George Routledge and Sons. 12/6.

IN the opinion of Judge Crabitès, the future of Europe depends today more upon the brain, the act, and activity of Beneš than upon any other factor.

When he wrote these, as the final words to his panegyric of Beneš as a statesman, the author had never actually seen Beneš in the flesh, though subsequently he made his acquaintance. Whether the future of Europe does depends upon Beneš, is something that will be as violently contradicted by the enemies of the League as it will be asserted by its friends.

The spectacle of a man who, like Beneš, "always knew what he wanted, who would obtain for him and how, when, and where he would reach the proper man," inspires with enthusiasm or dislike pretty much as you sympathize with the man's ends and purposes. Judge Crabitès accepts these purposes without reserve. Beneš was the man who did the right thing in getting completely rid of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire; the Hungarians who felt bitterness over his triumphs were unable to realize that war is war; he was and is the statesman of the hour. He remains in the position of Foreign Secretary "as the very incarnation of a policy upon which the peace of Europe largely depends." As for his person:

One of the most astonishing features of this prolonged ascendancy is the fact that Beneš has nothing of that personal magnetism which so often accounts for political success. . . . He appears to have dedicated his very being to a specific mission and to have cut himself off from the humdrum of everyday life. . . . He is an intellectual dynamo insulated from the nation he helped to bring into being and which his brain has converted into one of the great Powers of Europe.

How this work of conversion was done, though a familiar tale, bears retelling, and it centers around the indefatigable personality of this remarkable man who, in the embryo days of the Czechoslovak Republic, "was the national Council"; who, as Crabitès narrates, did not hesitate to create "sob stories" when it was necessary to gain the sympathy of his Western friends, who studied the psychology of meticulous French and suspicious British diplomats, campaigned in the United States, waited, pleaded, borrowed and lent, jumped by day and night from pillar to post, until one objective was reached as the stepping-stone to the next. To President Wilson, at the Peace Conference, Beneš appealed as a lover of the

recondite and abstruse . . . calculated to afford him intense intellectual pleasure. But Beneš never contents himself with playing upon one instrument. He is one of those versatile performers who can use a violin, blow a trombone, or beat a drum with equal dexterity.

In view of all that has happened afterwards, it is interesting to note how hard a time Beneš and Masaryk had in their early days of revolt and conspiracy in dissuading their Czech brethren from placing all hope in Russia: that the future for their liberty was in alliance with the West, not with the effusive but uncertain East. All that is past history now. Beneš tells the Soviet journalists visiting Prague on October 7 of this year, that they "may feel themselves at home among real friends. The common policy of Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia has found expression in the

pact of mutual assistance," and they can "confront together any dangerous situation that may arise in Europe or any other part of the world."

Considering that this work is by a Catholic author, it is a little puzzling that there is nothing therein to indicate what part such factors as religion, the Church, the Papacy, and the growth of the spirit of charity among the nations may have in the preservation of peace in Europe. Beneš himself, one may well believe, with all his religious neutrality, is more ready to admit these things than appears to be this his own admirer, who makes no mention of that exceedingly important series of negotiations that Beneš has carried on for years, concerning the *modus vivendi* between the Republic and the Holy See. Why this curious omission? Why such vagueness concerning the Slovak end of Czechoslovakia; no mention of the Slovak claims for autonomy, of the Pittsburgh agreement, of the profound moral issues involved at home as well as abroad? Crabitès simply finds that in Bratislava, capital of Slovakia, there is a "parade" of the Slovak language.

It is an intense and vivid, but not a balanced picture. Honor could have been done to Beneš' wonderful abilities while giving due to the doubtful and weak in his policy and position as well. After all, what is gained by idealization? The Wickham Steeds and the Seton-Watsons, whose works Czech patriots in this country slipped into the hands of their Anglo-Saxon friends, did call attention to flagrant abuses, ancient wrongs. But a convulsed Europe in later years has forced politicians to think more soberly, Beneš included; to retrace many a religiously and politically thoughtless step. We still wait for a sober, dispassionate picture of the Czechoslovak saga.

JOHN LAFARGE.

Shorter Reviews

ADVENTURE FOR HAPPINESS. By S. Parkes Cadman. The Macmillan Company. \$1.90. Published November 12.

IF Dr. Cadman had paused to ascertain more thoroughly "the experience of the race," in which he justly trusts, he would have had a better book on happiness. He has read widely. He cites scores of moderns for reflections on human felicity, which felicity, however, is ever of this world; and again, against many of the authors quoted, human experience shows in exactly 100 per cent of the cases it presents that we cannot have perfect felicity here. Dr. Cadman correctly seeks an increase of temporal happiness in literature, art and music, Christian domestic life, friendship, and social service. These are aids to happiness and its concomitants, but not its essence. Let us return to "the experience of the race."

Aristotle in the tenth book of the Nicomachean *Ethics* calls happiness "activity according to virtue." This is little in accord with Dr. Cadman's statement that Plato and Aristotle have divided the world of thinkers into deontologists and hedonists, Plato inculcating duty and Aristotle extolling pleasure. Aristotle's pleasure is virtuous activity, and one assumes from Dr. Cadman that Plato taught the same. Christian thought has never departed from Plato and Aristotle, and St. Thomas bases his *beatitudo* on their concepts. This experience of the race, arching milleniums, Dr. Cadman has neglected. He finds happiness in non-essentials, or at least does not sufficiently emphasize its essential nature of virtue and the conformity to Providence. Moreover, he seems to believe that evolution will one day shed the thorns of life's flowers, whereas the very "duty" of Aristotle and Plato foreshadowed the Christian cross, and their reasoned immortality was a preparation for Christian Faith in the day of Resurrection, when and when alone "every tear is wiped away."

J. W.

REVOLT ON THE CAMPUS. By James Wechsler. Covici-Friede. \$3.00.

THE author has contributed just another of the many publications now alive in our country to further and abet the cause of Moscow. This book throughout its 456 pages purposed to show

the growth of student ideas in social science since the World War, and the gradual awakening of college men to economic conditions in the United States. These conditions, it seems, can only be changed in the future by the "emancipating leaders of tomorrow," our revolting students.

Pacifistic thought pervades the volume. Interest is aroused in the peace movement through the medium of innumerable narratives dealing with the dismissal of students, professors, and college heads who for some reason or other dared to write openly in college periodicals or gave vent to opinions in the classroom at variance with constituted authority, thereby meriting the judgment of radicals, liberals, or atheists.

Much ado is made of "The New Student" and its variant sayings, while the escapade of a certain Kentucky expedition into Harlan County to examine the sufferings of mine workers leaves us with the inevitable conclusion that capitalists are in power not only in the colleges but even in the mines, and that they brook no interference from student investigators. The entire narration of episodes is rather monotonous and makes tiresome reading.

Granted that there is a revolt on some State-college campuses and that the enumeration of details as specified by the author is to some extent true, though colored with the subjective element of Communistic tendencies and notions, one fails to see how pacifism is to aid present-day circumstances or how it leads to the true solution of our economic troubles.

Mr. Wechsler admits that the revolt has not become widespread on the Catholic-college campus. He fails to analyze and explain why this should be so. The inculcation of sound Christian principles, together with proper cooperation on the part of students and college faculties, would go far towards answering all the difficulties presented in this book. The fear of Fascism looms up in Mr. Wechsler's mind. A worse menace may bud on the branches of pacifism with its clever underlying current of government destruction.

J. F. C.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO, 1936 AND 1937. Walter Romig and Company. \$4.50.

WHEN the first edition of this reference book was published in 1933, complaint was made that its projectors had failed in their stated purpose to make it "truly representative and, so far as possible, complete and accurate in detail." This second edition offers satisfactory evidence that they have tried by every practical effort to atone for the sins of omission and commission charged against their initial output, and to present in this a useful reference roll of Catholic men and women of achievement in the various avenues of human interest and activities. They are to be congratulated on this manifest success and should be given the substantial guerdon of approval in making the book a part of every complete reference department. Two-thousand names have been added to the first list, from which the mistakes have been eliminated; the handy geographical index has been retained, and the lists of converts, the Catholic members of Congress and the national Catholic organizations are other features. In all, this *Who's Who* gives the enterprise a fine start for evolution into a permanent and indispensable source of biographical information.

T. F. M.

AN ESSAY TOWARD A HISTORY OF EDUCATION. By W. Kane, S.J. Loyola University Press. \$2.40.

IT would scarcely be claiming too much to say that this book is the best short history of education in English. Though uncompromisingly Catholic in his philosophy of education, the author is not concerned with writing an apologetic. His wide and thorough reading in the manifold phases of educational history has made for an independence of judgment altogether rare in textbook writing. This is particularly manifest in his deflation of the claims of Locke, Pestalozzi, and Herbert, and in his discussion of the Reformation and Education.

It is unfortunate, however, that the author was not more detailed in his treatment of Jesuit educational personalities. While

Luther, Melanchthon, Sturm, and other protagonists of Protestant education are given individual attention, not a single educator of the early Society of Jesus, with the exception of St. Ignatius, is mentioned even by name. It might have been expected, too, that, since the author presents an analytic summary of the curriculum of Sturm's Gymnasium at Strassburg, a similar analysis would have been attempted of the *Ratio Studiorum*, which undoubtedly had a vaster educational influence than Sturm's restricted Strassburg venture. Perhaps the author's failure to give an adequate account of Jesuit education is to be explained by his wish to avoid the charge of seeming to signalize Jesuit achievement; perhaps it is the result of his somewhat unsympathetic view of the Renaissance and of humanistic education in general.

In spite of these defects of emphasis, the work under review deals competently with the whole field of Western educational history from the Hebrews to modern American educators. Of special interest and worth are the sections on Early Christian Education, the Middle Ages, and Democracy in Education. In this latter chapter the author is at his best in appraising the phases and philosophies of modern education. The bibliographic notes at the end of each chapter, which present a sound evaluation of source materials, are not the least valuable portion of the book.

Those who have read Father Kane's biographies of William Stanton and of St. Stanislaus need not be reminded that the author is master of a vigorous and original style.

A. P. F.

Recent Non-Fiction

SHINING MOMENT. By Virginia E. Huntington. The author has written a very personal book of verse, mirroring the many places in which she has passed an eventful life. The quality of the verse is varied. The poem called the "Chinese Lily" seems to the reviewer a good example of the genre most suited to the author's temperament. It is imageful, compact, and delicate without being fragile. "Caesura" and "Quiet Room" also share these qualities, though the emotion expressed is stronger. At times, however, the verse manifests a too fervid lyricism, rather dangerously near sentimentality. (Morehouse. \$1.75.)

THE EDUCATION OF CHAUCER. By George A. Plimpton. From his remarkable collection of contemporary manuscripts the compiler of this excellently printed volume has selected specimens which will illustrate the actual education of "Dan" Chaucer, the first and probably the greater of English Catholic poets. Here we see photographic reproductions from Isidor's encyclopedic *Etymologies*, from accounts of travel and history, elementary primers in full, in Middle English and in French, an arithmetic in full, and samples from classical and foreign writers. No less valuable than the reproduction of early school books, making available to all scholars treasures which are Mr. Plimpton's own, are the twenty-five pages of indices to biblical, mythological, and historical characters and to the medieval, classical, and ecclesiastical authors mentioned by Chaucer. The small volume is a delight to the bibliophile and a treasure for the scholar of this period or poet. Published December 5. (Oxford University Press. \$2.00.)

THE GREGORIAN CHANT MANUAL. By Bishop Schrembs, Sister Alice Marie, and Father Huegle. With the same attractive format as its predecessors this new volume shows conclusively the remarkable amount of painstaking preparation which the authors have expended upon it. Adhering faithfully to the principles of Dom Mocquereau and Solesmes, the book not only provides the Catholic teacher with a comprehensive account of the history, theory, and interpretation of Gregorian Chant, but also includes a detailed series of plans to be followed in every grade which should prove helpful. There is no doubt that the properly trained and experienced music teacher will find the work of real value in the Church's great work of restoring Gregorian Chant to the world through its children. (Silver, Burdett. \$3.00.)

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Italian Catholics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Many Catholics who have come into contact with Italians and Italian-Americans have undoubtedly had the same experience as the writer of the article, "Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?", in the issue of AMERICA for November 23. One summer about eight years ago, while vacationing as a student at Lake Garda in Italy, I made the acquaintance of a young Italian, a student at the University of Bologna. We became quite friendly and one Sunday morning as he met me coming from Mass, our conversation naturally drifted into religion. I asked him if he had been to Mass that morning. He laughed and told me that he used to go to church until he was about fourteen years old but now that he was grown up he no longer bothered. He said that his mother and his sisters went but that he and his father and the Italian men in general (*noi uomini*) weren't interested in the Church.

My experience in dealing with Italians and Italian-Americans has convinced me that they adopt pretty much the same attitude toward the Church in this country. Here in our diocese everything possible has been done to make practical Catholics out of the Italians but the results are most discouraging. I think that most priests engaged in Italian work will agree to this. Here in one of our large cities, for example, we have a Catholic grammar school in which nearly all the children are of Italian extraction. One of the nuns, who has labored with really apostolic zeal in this school for many years, told me that the children there as a rule are faithful to their church duties as long as they are in grammar school, but that once they finish—the boys in particular—it is just good-bye to the Church in most cases. The reason is evident. The good work accomplished by the Sisters and priests is offset by the religious indifference of the home.

The entire Italian religious situation is a most disheartening one. Four years ago a missionary priest who has given missions in practically every State of the Union remarked that his experience led him to believe that Italians as a class throughout the United States were very much the same—nominal Catholics, little interested in their religion and by no means practical in its application.

This is a big problem for the Church in this country. For my part, from experience in this part of the Lord's vineyard, I believe that the American clergy has worked hard and is keeping up this hard work for our religiously indifferent Italian brethren. *Oremus et laboremus* and let us hope that some sweet day we may see the fruits of our efforts.

Connecticut.

SACERDOS.

Catechisms

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Anent an editorial which appeared in AMERICA under date of November 16, 1935, entitled: "Our Catechisms," I concede that many modern elementary catechisms have gone to extremes in approaching the format of the modern textbook, and that these textbooks are not much of an improvement, if any, over the type of text that was in use a generation ago. Very likely these modern catechisms will shortly fall into disuse and be replaced by others, seeking to keep pace with the changing vagaries of illusive pedagogic ideals. A serviceable catechism must needs be compiled, keeping what is best in tradition.

I contend, however, that although we need a catechetical text that accurately presents Catholic belief and practice, yet we need one that is written in the current language of the present day, especially in the language of children. Perhaps such texts as the Baltimore and Deharle Catechisms were intelligible to children a hundred years ago; but not so at the present time. Books that were written in a popular style then make heavy reading now. Thus we are informed that Cardinal Newman's "Discourses to a Mixed Congregation" were readily followed by the London audience of his day. However I dare say that these same discourses are not easily followed at the present day.

It strikes me that in the compilation of catechisms this difficulty has often arisen: those who know the language of children are not sufficiently versed in religion to set forth accurately and systematically its definitions and truths. And those who are versed in the knowledge of religion, know little or nothing of children's language. The compiler of a teachable and serviceable catechism, to my mind, must be one who has mastered knowledge of the Catholic religion, and at the same time has mastered a command of children's language. It is encouraging to see that this and kindred catechetical problems were discussed at the Rochester convention, and also by such high-class reviews as AMERICA.

Louisville, Ky.

(Rev.) Jos. A. NEWMAN.

Catholic Parent-Teacher Movement

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The article by M. E. DuPaul, entitled: "The Parent-Teacher Movement," in the issue of AMERICA for December 28, should give thought to everyone interested in Catholic education. There is no doubt that Catholics are far behind their confrères but this is not altogether due to the parents of children attending Catholic schools. We are all agreed that the logical person to initiate and encourage a Catholic parent-teacher group is the pastor, but what is the situation if the pastor refuses to have such a group though the parents feel the necessity is most urgent?

A copy of this most interesting and timely article should be sent to every Bishop and Diocesan Superintendent of Schools, as it is only by instructions issued by them to all their pastors that the Catholic parent-teacher movement can be made effective. The parents will be found willing providing their pastors give them some encouragement.

Port Washington, N. Y.

A READER.

Ayes and Noes

To the Editor of AMERICA:

There is a *non sequitur* in Mr. O'Shaughnessy's article, "Social Standards under the Constitution," in the issue of AMERICA for October 12, where he has written: "The minority opinion of four dissenting Justices, in the case of Hammer v. Dagenhart (247 U. S. 251), upheld the right of the Federal Government under the commerce clause. . . . From the foregoing, I conclude that Congress has the power, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, to set up social standards," etc. The only conclusion the premises support is that four judges disagreed with the law as determined by the other five justices whose decision is final. Most assuredly, the Federal Child Labor law, which Congress enacted under the guise of commerce control (and later attempted under a subterfuge of tax legislation: Baily v. Drexel Furniture Co., 259 U. S. 20), is not being enforced by United States marshals despite the logic of the dissenting judges and the conclusion of Mr. O'Shaughnessy. Congressional power to enact social legislation operative within the States is not to be found in express words in the Constitution, and the Supreme Court—albeit in divided decisions—has very definitely ruled that the Federal Government cannot do indirectly what it may not do directly.

One more consideration: agreeing substantially with everything

said in that article as to the desirability of Federal minimum-wage social legislation, the constitutional obstacle can never be forgotten. Such a law was adopted for the District of Columbia, over which Congressional power is more extensive than over State matters, only to be rendered ineffective by the Court (*Adkins v. Children's Hospital*, 261 U. S. 523) on the ground that it invaded "freedom of contract." The dissenting opinions in this case are masterpieces of judicial reasoning, but the fact remains that Congress does not have the power.

If, as the editor notes, Mr. O'Shaughnessy really believes "that adequate social legislation can be passed by Congress without changing the Constitution," he must find some new method of procedure (other than the commerce clause) or change the existing precedents. As the facts now stand, neither the commerce nor the tax clause are available to disguise social action so as to bring it within Federal jurisdiction. It may be unfortunate, but we have as yet devised no method of reaching decisions by weighing the logic of the various judicial opinions, so one really must not support arguments on minority views. (I have often wondered why dissents were published.) The noes are valueless. The result is final when the ayes and noses are counted. If that be a pun, make the best of it.

West De Pere, Wis.

BASIL R. REUSS, O.PRAEM.

A Reply

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Dennis F. Burns, S.J., in the issue of AMERICA for December 14, took me to task for a letter which I wrote for the November 16 issue and which appeared in the Communications column. I think the good Father Burns was just a little hard on me in the rather vehement way he applied the lash. There is such a thing as trying to get a man's point of view before attacking him.

I used the word *naturalism* in the sentence: "If naturalism is the correct interpretation of life, the birth controllers are very much in the right," as a synonym for materialism, and the justification for this usage is Webster's New International Dictionary, 1928 edition, page 1439. In this sense the naturalist denies not merely revelation but the existence of spiritual being: since there is no God according to this system of thought, there can be no law, either natural or supernatural: all things are the result of chance and expediency is the only logical mode of ethics. When I proposed "the preaching of Christ and Christ crucified to overcome the fallacy of the birth-control movement. There is no other way," Father Burns got the idea that I had said there is no other possible way. This I emphatically did not say or mean. My meaning was there is no other effective way. Witness what happened to the Roman civilization: the Romans had the natural law but they had not Christ. In order to combat an evil as flagrant as the birth-control evil, we should employ the strongest weapons by emphasizing the supernatural.

Detroit, Mich.

REV. E. A. LEPEBURE.

Economics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Last week I took up a copy of a book by Father Coughlin, issued in March, 1935, entitled: "A Series of Lectures on Social Justice." At the same time I took out again copies of the *Catholic Mind* for April 8, 1931, and for June 8, 1931, giving the text of two famous Encyclicals. Like thousands of other American citizens, I suppose, I am trying to get at what you philosophically and logically trained men call, I believe, the objective truth of some of these matters now being discussed everywhere. No easy task for men like myself; with no training whatever in logic or philosophy; and limited education. In going back over newspaper and magazine files in order to find the viewpoint of those who were opposed to Father Coughlin's position, I could find very little except matter more or less vituperative or name-calling

in character. Except in one case; where I reached in the public library here copies of AMERICA of May 18, May 25, and June 1, 1935, which I have read attentively, and which are very helpful in arriving at a correct judgment.

In your article of May 18 I read:

He [Father Coughlin] condemns the system because it has produced poverty in the midst of plenty, has brought about an undue concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, has induced a domination of industry by the banks, has destroyed rather than distributed private property. Readers of Pope Pius XI will recognize and admit all this. His diagnosis of this state of affairs, however, differs from that of the Pope, who puts the cause of it in the industrial order, while Father Coughlin blames it almost entirely on the monetary or currency situation that he sees prevailing.

Turning to the Encyclical, "Quadragesimo Anno," I read:

In the first place, then, it is patent that in our days not only is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure. This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood to the entire economic body, and grasping as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will.

It seems to me that Father Coughlin's diagnosis does not differ from that of the Pope in this regard.

Norwich, Conn.

MAURICE E. MURPHY.

[Our correspondent exhibits a common confusion of thought. The Pope is talking of the financial, not the currency, situation, and is demanding financial, not monetary, reform. The financial situation is an essential part of the industrial order; the currency situation results from it, is not one of its causes. Ed. AMERICA.]

Information

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In answer to a reader who was wondering whether copies of the Funeral Mass were available, permit me to call attention to the "Funeral Mass and Burial Service for Adults," a booklet published by the Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minn., at ten cents per copy, with liberal discounts in lots.

Collegeville, Minn.

V. REV. REMBERT BULARZIK, O.S.B.

A Catholic Daily

To the Editor of AMERICA:

At the meeting of the Catholic Action department of the National Welfare Conference held in Washington last month Bishop Lillis, the Episcopal Chairman of that department, ranked the press with the movie and the radio as the three most important media that now influence the people of this nation, even counteracting the influence of church, home, and school. I have just read an article by Frank H. Spearman in *Ave Maria*, in which he impeaches the Catholics of America for allowing the enemies of the Church the almost exclusive use in their war against her, of that "most powerful modern world influence, the daily press." He cites with indignation the case of Mexico in which news of the hideous crimes against Catholics is suppressed by the secular papers of this country while the outrageous lies of the Mexican propagandists get full publicity and are believed. Our high-class Catholic periodicals, he says, do not reach the reading public.

If the New York dailies can reach millions in cities as distant as Washington, Boston, Buffalo, and Pittsburgh every morning, why cannot a well-conducted daily under Catholic management do the same? And so for other centers like Chicago, Omaha, New Orleans, and San Francisco. Communists can finance their lying sheets of five and ten thousand circulation. Why cannot a Catholic corporation provide the antidote?

Washington, D. C.

CATHOLIC.

C h r o n i c l e

Home News.—In a sudden change of plans, President Roosevelt decided to deliver his annual message on "the state of the nation" at an evening session of Congress on January 3. The message was broadcast from the House chamber. Congressional leaders were not aware of the plan until radio broadcasters sought permission to place their equipment in the House chamber. However, leaders of Congress quickly agreed to the President's program. On January 1 Henry P. Fletcher, chairman of the Republican National Committee, attacked the plan as a political move. In telegrams to the two broadcasting companies carrying the message, he asked for an allotment of time, similar in hour, stations, and length to that given the President, for a Republican reply to his statements. On January 1 the three veterans' organizations—the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans of the World War—agreed on a bonus plan. They estimated that a cash expenditure of approximately \$1,000,000,000 would be required, and asked, among other provisions, for immediate full cash payment of the adjusted service certificates; refund of interest paid on loans on certificates; cancellation of interest accrued and unpaid; and issuance of special Government obligations in lieu of adjusted service certificates now held as security by the United States life-insurance reserve account (about \$500,000,000 in value). A White House conference agreed on a neutrality bill to be submitted to Congress. It included both mandatory and discretionary features, it was reported, although details were not available. Senator Copeland announced that he would introduce a ship-subsidy bill, which would embody the recommendations that President Roosevelt made in his message of last March 4. The weekly publication of the Townsend organization on December 28 listed thirty-nine House members said to have promised to vote for the plan when it comes up for consideration in Congress. The Guffey coal-stabilization Act was declared unconstitutional in Federal Court in Kansas City on December 31, and an injunction was granted against its enforcement. In a report to the President on December 27, the National Resources Committee recommended the establishment of ten or twelve Federal sub-capitals to facilitate cooperation with States on regional problems. On December 28 Administrator Hopkins ordered reorganization of the WPA for efficiency. In his annual report, issued on December 29, Postmaster General Farley claimed a net surplus of \$4,964,149.31 for the year. However, the Department's total expenditures exceeded total revenues by \$64,807,951, due to matter carried under frank, etc. In the political arena, Representative Hamilton Fish said that he had been authorized to organize New York State for Senator Borah in the fight for delegates to the Republican national convention. Alfred E. Smith, who is to speak before the Liberty League in Washington later in the month, caused a flurry

in Democratic circles when he declined an invitation to stay at the White House during his visit.

Laval Wins Again.—Two days of furious debate upon Premier Laval's foreign policy marked the year's last mid-week in the French Parliament. The Right flatly expressed its fear of League sanctions; the Left, supported by the Center, accused the Premier of having lost the real friendship of Great Britain and of failing in his obligations to the League. Nobody expected the Premier to survive the ordeal. But he made what observers called the best defense and fighting speech of his career, and when a vote of confidence was put he won a number of his opponents on the Right. The balloting stood 296 to 276, a small majority, but large enough to stave off the defeat which had been predicted. One of the reactions to this event was the resignation by M. Tardieu from the Republican Center party, whose president had voted against Laval. M. Tardieu's letter of resignation was filled with bitter denunciation of Great Britain, whom he blamed for failure to organize the sanctions and ultimately for France's present hardships. On the first day of the new year, the Parliamentary sessions were adjourned for two weeks after the Deputies and Senators had passed the budget. Only on paper, all observers admitted, did the national income slightly exceed the expenditures. The real and serious deficit of about 7,000,000,000 francs remained, further complicated by the fact that M. Laval's widely heralded economies had not proved overwhelmingly successful. The problem of financial equilibrium was thus passed on to the future.

New Spanish Cabinet.—The Portela Cabinet resigned on December 30, after a term lasting only fifteen days, principally because several members insisted on liberty of political action. But President Alcalá Zamora persisting in his fear that the Popular Actionists were Monarchists at heart, refused to invite Sr. Gil Robles to take the Ministry. Instead, he returned Sr. Portela, who quickly formed a new Government in which the Popular Actionists were not represented, which was chiefly independent, and which, it was readily conceded, had no Parliamentary support. At the same time a decree dissolving the Cortes was written, and though it remained unsigned as yet by the President, it was expected it would be effectuated about February 1. This would put the national elections sixty days later, in early April.

German Refugees Commissioner Resigns.—James G. McDonald, High Commissioner for refugees coming from Germany (Jewish and others), wrote on December 27 to the Secretariat of the League of Nations tendering his resignation from that office, on the ground that recent German legislation had made the condition of the afflicted minorities such that it was now a political matter that would need to be handled directly by the League of Nations. Mr. McDonald, former director of the Foreign Policy Association in New York City, held his office for two years, during which time he succeeded in finding

homes for about three-quarters of the 80,000 refugees from Germany. In his letter of resignation he stated that he considered his work severely handicapped by the divorce that was established at the outset between the commission and the League. Said Mr. McDonald:

The new legislation has altered the entire complexion of the refugee problem. At least half a million people have been deprived of their political rights, their civil status has become that of "guests or wards" of the state, and a threat of even more drastic action against them has been pronounced before the Reichstag.

The intensified persecution in Germany, said Mr. McDonald, threatens the pauperization or exile of hundreds of thousands of Germans—men, women, and children—not only Jews but also the "non-Aryan" Christians treated as Jews, and Protestants and Catholics as well. Appealing to recognition which the principle of respect for religious and racial minorities has gained in recent years, as shown by minorities treaties, he urged that the League should appeal to the "broad considerations of humanity and international peace," and exert intercession with the persecuting Government. The McDonald letter aroused extended press comment abroad and in the United States.

Reich Denies Pact Offer.—The report spread abroad by the foreign press that Germany offered Britain a bilateral air pact in conversations held on December 12 and 13 between Chancellor Hitler and Sir Eric Phipps, British Ambassador, was denied by an authoritative official of the Reich Government. Likewise denied was the statement made in foreign papers that Germany had demanded colonies and a change in the Anglo-German naval pact. The meeting between Chancellor Hitler and Ambassador Phipps treated solely the German position on arms limitation and the question of a Western European air pact by the Locarno signatory Powers, the Reich spokesman declared. Chancellor Hitler, in a New Year's message to the nation, said: "A decisive year of German defense history has come and gone: the Reich is again free and strong."

Reich Curbs Protestants.—The Rev. Martin Niemoeller, influential Protestant pastor, was held under arrest in his apartment. Arrests of clergymen were being made under the direction of Reich Church Minister Hanns Kerrl. The Right Rev. August Marahrens, influential Protestant leader, was reported to have abandoned opposition to the Reich dictatorship of the Protestant church and to have begun giving full cooperation to it. The secret political police rearrested the Rev. Gerhard Jacobi, Protestant pastor, to prevent him from delivering a New Year's sermon. The Minister for Church Affairs, Hanns Kerrl, issued a New Year's greeting, declaring that God's special blessing is upon Chancellor Hitler and that the Nazi program is God's program. His address was characterized by independent Protestant spokesmen as an example of Nordic paganism. They declared the Minister represented the Christian religion as something of no spiritual significance except as it aided the Nazi program.

Ethiopian Military Successes.—As Premier Mussolini attempted in a Cabinet speech to calm the growing anxiety of his people over the inactivity of their armies in Ethiopia, news dispatches from the African front indicated that the warriors of Haile Selassie were pressing their recently gained advantage. Three large armies were reported as heading towards Makale, and military observers were predicting that the most sanguinary fighting and probably, too, the most critical engagement of the whole war were due during the coming week. Reports that Italian planes had bombed a Swedish Red Cross hospital with serious loss of life were not yet confirmed. But the Ethiopian Emperor informed the League that Italian bombers had resorted to the use of gas bombs.

British Recovery.—December figures on reemployment, released by the Ministry of Labor, indicated a healthy industrial revival. The number of the unemployed dropped by fifty thousand to 1,868,565. Besides the seasonal improvement in the distributive trades, there was a gratifying increase in employment in engineering, iron and steel manufacture, and cotton. Every area but Scotland shared in the improvement, although the increase in employment in the Southwestern region was slight. According to a statement by Sir Thomas Inskip, Attorney General, it was clear that the Government was planning to buy out the owners of coal-mining royalties. Abolition of "Queen Anne's bounty," a system of land tithes for the benefit of the Church of England, was also foreshadowed.

Relations with Germany.—The tension between Germany and Lithuania with regard to Memel inspired the British Government to attempt some easing of the situation. The intervention took the form of a request, transmitted through Ambassador Sir Eric Phipps, that the German Government inform the British Government whether it was willing to exchange political prisoners with the Lithuanian Government. Since Ramsay MacDonald has always advocated more friendly relations with the German Reich, the candidacy of the former Prime Minister and his son, Malcolm, for seats in the House of Commons with Government support was interpreted as another effort to conciliate Hitler. Reports from London also indicated that there was a disposition on the part of the Baldwin Government to promote Germany's restoration as a colonial Power by means of cessions of land in Portuguese Africa.

Mexican Events.—In his New Year's message, President Cárdenas promised the Mexican workers and farmers during the coming year "every possible support within the precepts of the law." He said that at the end of 1935 the Treasury had a surplus of 32,500,000 pesos. Eduardo Suárez, Secretary of the Treasury, arrived in Washington on December 30 to confer with Secretary Morgenthau on the international silver situation, which was giving Mexico some concern. Secretary Morgenthau recently stated that the United States purchased all the

newly mined silver offered by Mexico. Mexican officials on December 28 claimed that any threat of a revolution caused by the return to Mexico of General Calles had definitely passed.

Argentine Cabinet Reorganizes.—A Cabinet crisis threatening all during 1935 came to a head on December 30 when President Justo announced the acceptance of the resignations of three Cabinet Ministers. The reorganization was a victory for the Minister of the Interior, Leopoldo Melo, and an effort by President Justo for a reconciliation with the Radical party. The new Cabinet is as follows: Interior, Leopoldo Melo; Foreign Affairs, Carlos Saavedra Lamas; Justice and Public Instruction, Ramon S. Castillo; Finance, Roberto O. Ortiz; Public Works, Manuel R. Alvarado; Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, Miguel A. Carcano; War, Brig.-Gen. Manuel A. Rodriguez; and Marine, Rear Admiral Eleazar Videla.

Uruguay Breaks with Russia.—On December 27, charging that the Soviet Legation had been directing and financing subversive Communistic agitation against South American countries from Montevideo, the Uruguayan Government severed diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. The action was precipitated by representations from Argentine and Brazil regarding agitators financed from Montevideo. Uruguay up to the present had been the only South American country recognizing Soviet Russia. Russia formally protested the severance of relations to the League of Nations as a violation of the League Covenant, since Uruguay did not first submit its complaints to the League for arbitration or to the Soviet Union. In his New Year's message President Terra restored constitutional guarantees suspended during last January's revolt.

New Government in Venezuela.—As an aftermath of the death of President Gomez, unconfirmed reports of scattered rioting were reported in American newspapers, though officials at Caracas announced that the Government was in "absolute control" in all States. On December 31 Congress, amid a near riot, elected War Minister Eleazar Lopez Contreras, Acting-President since Gomez' death, as President until the elections in April. Lopez was one of the chief lieutenants of Gomez. On January 1 the new Cabinet was announced: Interior, Jose R. Ayala; Foreign, Diogenes Escalante; Treasury, Gustavo Herrera; War and Navy, Chalbaud Cardona; Industry, Alejandro Lara; Public Works, Tomas Pacanins; Instruction, Romulo Gallegos; Health and Agriculture, Elias Rodriguez. Lopez immediately after assuming provisional authority on December 17 made an appropriation of 30,000,000 bolivars for the purchase of 600,000 bags of coffee. This was intended to relieve agricultural distress. He also decreed press censorship and martial law.

Australia Strengthens Defenses.—Increased appropriations in the budget for defense will provide greater ef-

fectiveness in the army, navy, and air forces of the Commonwealth. Anti-aircraft guns are to be manufactured in Australia and additional anti-aircraft searchlights purchased. The navy will be strengthened by the new cruiser Sydney and the sloop Yarra. Civil aviation will also be greatly encouraged, especially with respect to radio direction-finding equipment. Transport services and artillery units in the army will be completely mechanized.

Soviet Production.—Speaking at the close of the year, G. K. Ordjonikidze, Commissar for Heavy Industry, heralded as phenomenal recent advances in Soviet production, e.g., coal, peat, iron ore, pig iron, steel, aluminum, rolling stock, automobiles, as compared with 1925, ascribed to advance in technical knowledge and development of natural resources. At the same time, the Moscow *Pravda* for November 12, 1935, published an address on the agricultural situation by Peter Postyshev, leader in the Communist party in the Ukraine, in which he deplored the continued disturbances in the collective farms and the retrograde tendencies in the cattle industry.

Austria and Otto.—A report was circulated that the Turkish Foreign Minister, visiting Vienna, had conveyed to the Austrian Government the concern of the Balkan Entente over a possible restoration of the Hapsburg monarchy. Two more Austrian communities made Archduke Otto an honorary citizen. More than a thousand cities and villages have bestowed this honor upon him.

Labor Conference in Chile.—On January 2, in the presence of President Arturo Alessandri, the Pan-American Labor Conference convened at Santiago. Representatives of nineteen states of North, Central, and South America participated. For the first time in the history of Pan-American meetings Canada sent a delegate. The opening session was given over to preliminaries and the election of officers and committees. Meetings were called by each of the three groups at the conference, representing governments, employers, and workers. The conference noted with approval that as a way out of the present crisis lowering of wages or cutting of living standards was not being advocated.

When Hungary opposed sanctions against Italy by the League of Nations, what was her purpose? Dr. Tibor Kerekes, of Georgetown University, will essay next week to interpret her action, in "World Peace, Sanctions, and Hungary."

To the burning question of constitutional revision to make social reform possible, John W. Curran, of De Paul University, will go back to James Madison for his answer, in "A Council of Revision of Laws in 1935?"

Vincent de Paul Fitzpatrick, a Baltimore newspaperman, will present a novel interview in "A Georgia Sailor."

Dr. Marie R. Madden has some interesting views in "The Catholic Order and the Negro."